

Cudworth (W.)
W. Gorton
A
PRESERVATIVE

IN

PERILOUS TIMES.

In THREE LETTERS.

I.

To Mr. JAMES RELLY,
Relative to his misleading Principles in RELIGION.

II.

To Mr. JOHN WESLEY,
Occasion'd by the Revival of his *Dialogues*, in a
late TREATISE, called, *A Preservative against*
Unsettled Notions.

III.

To Mr. JOHN WESLEY,
Occasion'd by his LETTER of *Remarks* on THERON
and ASPASIO, publish'd in the above-mention'd
PRESERVATIVE.

L O N D O N :

Sold by G. KEITH, in *Gracechurch-Street*; M. LEWIS,
in *Paternoster-Row*; T. SMITH, in *Ship-Alley, Wall-*
close-Square; and at the *New-chapel in Margate-*
Street, near Oxford-Market.

PRESERVATIVE

IN

PERILOUS TIMES

IN THESE TIMES

I.

TO MR. JAMES R. KELLY

Relative to his manuscript Principles in Religion



TO MR.

Ordered by the Council of the British Museum, to be printed, and a copy to be given to the Author, as a mark of their appreciation of his labours.

III.

TO MR. JOHN W. LESTER

Ordered by the Council of the British Museum, to be printed, and a copy to be given to the Author, as a mark of their appreciation of his labours.

LONDON

Printed by C. Knight, at the British Museum, in the year 1851.

CONTENTS.

IN THREE LETTERS.

I. TO Mr. JAMES RELLY.—Mr. *Relly's* principles ascertain'd, by the arguments of his pupils, concurring with plain quotations from his writings, p. 5—11. The true union of Christ and his church, p. 6, 7. What unites, p. 7. *Mystery* how to be understood, p. 8, 9.—15, 16, 17. Mr. *Relly's* proofs for Christ's *humanity being the church* examin'd, p. 11. Not conclusive from our being circumcised, crucified, and risen with him—not from our being members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones.—Not from his being *Immanuel*, God with us.—Not from our maker being our husband, p. 12.—Not from these words *the soul that sins shall die*, p. 13. Christ's humanity no other person but himself, except by union and substitution, p. 13, 14. What a personal existence or person is, *note* p. 15. What is sin by the law, *note* p. 17. How Christ could bear our sin, without becoming the very soul that sin'd, p. 17, 18, 19. The nonsense of the notion of Christ's healing our nature, p. 19.—23 Abuse of the word body as well as nature, p. 23, 24, 25. Universal salvation not conclusive from scripture—the goodness of God—nor sufficiency of Christ's atonement, p. 27, 28, 29. The object of faith, true union, and ground of claim to Christ, p. 28. Faith assures without waiting for a sight of its own act, *ibid.* Wherein the mystery of union with Christ really lies, p. 30. Evil of Mr. *Relly's* scheme, p. 31. Vine and branches, p. 32.

II. To Mr. JOHN WESLEY.—Christ's *merits* ambiguous, p. 34, 35. Christ bearing sin away, p. 36, 37, 38. The Time of discharge from sin, *ibid.* The false supposition implied in Mr. *Wesley's* and Mr. *Relly's*

C O N T E N T S.

Relly's plans, 39. Their different inferences from that misleading supposition detected, p. 40. Forgiveness not conditional, p. 41. How these words, *be that believeth shall be saved*, are to be understood, p. 42. Another common principle of error, wherein Mr. *Wesley* and Mr. *Relly* agree, p. 43. The different use they make of the same false principle, *ibid.* The most dangerous doctrinal Antinomianism, p. 44, 45. Mr. *Wesley* and Mr. *Relly* answered together, p. 46. The objection, "then you are not saved by what Christ has already done, but by a something more," answered *, p. 47. The argument, "If I am saved by what Christ has already done, then I am saved whether I receive it or no", answered, p. 47, 48. Christian liberty, p. 49--51. Mr. *Wesley's* doctrine of the act of believing being our righteousness to acceptance with God, considered, p. 52. Overthrown by the homilies of the church, p. 53. How faith is imputed for righteousness according to the scriptures, i. e. because of the righteousness it receives and possesses, p. 54. Mr. *Wesley's* faith (which neither is, nor receives righteousness,) and works flowing from it, totally unscriptural, p. 55, 56. How to establish the law and good works, 57. Sanctification, 58, 59. The right use of reason, p. 61.

III. To Mr. JOHN WESLEY,---Imputation of Christ's righteousness, a scripture doctrine, p. 65. *Aspasio* does not separate the active from the passive obedience of Christ, p. 67. Those places considered where Mr. *Wesley* opposes *Aspasio* on a supposition unproved, p. 68, 76. Where he pretends to be more extensive in his notions of the grace of God, p. 76. The various false turns given to the scriptures, p. 80. Conclusion, p. 90. Postscript.

* This is the main argument of the author of the *Letters on Theron and Aspasio*, against the appropriating faith *Aspasio* pleads for.

A

LETTER

TO

Mr. *James Relly.*Mr. *Relly,*

YOU may remember, that some Years ago, I sent you privately my Thoughts on your absurd Peculiarities in Doctrine; and, indeed, should not concern myself any farther; but I find, on the Account of some evangelical Appearances in the Matter you deliver, the Poison insinuates with many who are not able to separate the Precious from the Vile. However I may be censured by your zealous Adherents, or whatever Usage I may meet with on Account of this Attempt, nothing will convince me, it is not the Lord's Will I should engage in it, but a Conviction I am not on the Side of Truth.

This Necessity of some one manifesting your misleading Fancies, appears more evidently, by that Height of Folly some of your Adepts are arrived at; as appeared by their late Debate with me before a Number of Witnesses. The Substance of which I take this Opportunity of presenting you with; After which,

B

which, I shall consider those Peculiarities in your Doctrine by which you have initiated them in their present way of Thinking.

Hearing one of them (as I sat in the Vestry after Sermon) say to a Number that was gathered round them, that I had been preaching Lies to the People, I desired they would come in and let me know what Lies. They came in, and told me I denied Union with Christ. I said, the Charge was not true; they knew I maintained Union of the Person of Christ God-Man, with the Persons of his People who are called his Members, and that I looked upon the Head to contain the Members as their Substitute or Representative in Virtue of that Union. *Opposition to this, they affirm'd, that Christ's Humanity was the very Church itself.* I replied, that to affirm that Christ's Humanity was the whole or very Church in itself, was an arrant Falsity. They brought for their Proof, that *David said in the Psalms, They pierced my Hands and my Feet*; that *David's Hands and Feet were not pierced, and therefore it must be understood of Christ.* I answered, true, this was meant of Christ, but not sufficient to prove, that Christ's Humanity was more than a Substitute for his Body the Church. They insisted upon it nevertheless, that *Christ's Humanity was the Church*, and that *Christ was the only Believer.* I desired them to prove that: They went about to prove, that *Christ was a Believer.* I told them, that was not the Matter in Question; but, whether Christ was the *only Believer.* They then ran to the *Time of Union*, and asserted that it was *when Christ assumed the human Nature.* I observed, in Answer to this, that that was the Time of the *personal Union* of the Divine and Human Nature in the one Mediator between God and MEN, the MAN Christ Jesus; but that there was another Union besides this to be considered, or there could be

be no Church, only a Head without a Body. That this Union, tho' in the Mind of God eternal; tho' in Christ's Life, Death and Resurrection; the Persons of the Members that were, or were to be, were represented in the Person of their Head Christ, God and Man; yet all this does also necessarily suppose the actual Personal Existence of the Parties united, for whatever is united must exist first, whether in the Divine Mind, or otherwise; or there is nothing to be united. Again, whatever is united must have some common Bond of Union; that I knew of no other Bond than being *by one Spirit baptized into one Body*, when we are brought into the Belief of that Truth whereunto we are called by the apostolic Gospel, *2 Theff. ii. 13.* And therefore I looked upon this same Union of Persons, with the Person of the Head Christ, to be the very eternal Union in the Divine Mind, and the Substance of that Union when a Part stood for the whole under the Demands of the Law: And to set one of these Views in Opposition to the other, was only playing Tricks with divine Things, and make them dance about just to serve our Purposes and create Confusion. I was asked then, by one of them, whether our Act of Believing united us to Christ. I answered, No: That properly speaking, it was God himself that united us, and not any Act of ours; but that the Union was by the Divine Ordination, and by the common Bond of one Spirit and one Truth, and therefore consummated at that Time, tho' in the Divine Mind eternal. They then ran back to their old Story, and one of them peremptorily asserted, that *He was actually and personally in the Womb of the Virgin Mary*; to which the Rest deliberately assented as their Opinion also. I then said to them, "Now observe, don't let us mistake you, we allow ourselves to be really one with Christ, by real actual Union of our Persons with his Person,

and that we might be said to be virtually contain'd in Christ when he died and rose again, as a Representative or Substitute, the Head for the Members of the mystical Body; only we oppose the Notion that "Christ's Humanity, assumed of the Virgin, is the mystical Body, or whole Church and Bride of God." Observe the Distinction of *natural Body* from *mystical Body*; Christ's natural Body is proper to himself, as mine and yours are proper to us: These may be united to His by some common Bond of Union; but Christ's Body, in this Sense, his natural Body, cannot be any other in itself than the Humanity of himself, the Head; nor can ours be any other than ourselves; that this Distinction subsists notwithstanding all Unions whatever, and cannot be otherwise, unless we cease to exist. They rejected this Distinction, and insisted upon it, notwithstanding all that was said, that Christ's Humanity was the whole Church or mystical Body, and that they were personally in the Womb of the Virgin Mary, only it was a Mystery, and I took it carnally, (*i. e.* I did not swallow it whole in the Lump without examining into the Falsity and Contradiction of it.) Then I replied, that I might as well insist upon it that any one Thing is another Thing only it is a Mystery; and such People are not further to be talked with; for no Demonstration can shew the Assertion to be more evidently false than it is at first Sight. The Mystery of the Trinity, though a Truth above Comprehension, is not a Contradiction to common Sense, for THREE in one Respect may be ONE in another Respect. The Mystery of the divine and human Nature in the one Person of Christ the Mediator implies no Contradiction; for the eternal WORD may as possibly be made one with a true Body and reasonable Soul, as Body and Soul may be united in one Man. The mystical Union of Christ's Person with our Persons in one mystical Body consisting of many Persons,

Persons, implies no Contradiction, because as the former Unions are possible this is also. But that Christ's Humanity assumed of the Virgin is the whole Church or is in itself any other than Himself alone, is a Thing absolutely and in it self evidently false, and therefore can be no Mystery.

The Doctrine you have advanced to the bringing your Disciples to the abovemention'd height of Folly, (which they mistakenly suppose to be the highest Dispensation of the present Age) I apprehend is contained in the following Quotations.

1. Asserting, That Christ Humanity assumed of the Virgin is the whole Church or contains it in it-self.

" In the Mystery of the Person of Jesus (you say)
 " there are two Natures, viz. God and Man, and this
 " human Nature thus Assumed of the Virgin, did in
 " the Mystery contain IN IT SELF, the whole Church
 " and Bride of God. By which Mystery of Union
 " with, and EXISTENCE and BEING IN THAT NA-
 " TURE, the whole Church hath together with Him
 " the Adoption and Son-ship, and all the Rights and
 " Privileges pertaining thereunto.*" *Hymn Book,*
pref. p. 9.

" For as Jesus when passing by the Angels that fell,
 " took upon him the Seed of Abraham, the Mystical
 " Constitution of his Humanity was FALLEN MAN,
 " who ARE THEREFORE considered as Members of
 " his Body." *Salvat. Comp. p. 4.*

" God—passing by more glorious Natures, hath ta-
 " ken us on himself—raising us to such an Eminence
 " that when he brought His first begotten Son into the

B 3

" World,

* Before he comes to this Explication he takes Pains to condemn every other System he can think on, and having condemn'd them all round, advances this in Opposition to them all.

" World, he commanded all the Angels of God to
" worship Him." *Ibid* p. 8.

" His Body as thus Existing in Him, entered in
" with Him and in Him there for ever." p. 39.

" The Mystery of the Person of Jesus as God Man—
" as Immanuel God with us—the Union of Natures
" IN HIM, being that Marriage Union where our Ma-
" ker is our Husband, *Isa.* liv. 5." *Trial of Spirits.*
p. 21.

2. That Christ in his Divinity contains the Church
as his Humanity.

" Our Existence and Being in Jesus as THE CON-
" STITUTION AND FULLNESS OF HIS HUMANITY AS
" WHICH we passed with Him, and in Him, through
" every State and Condition which he passed through,
" even to that Summit of Perfection and Glory which
" he is ascended to." *Hymn Book, preface*, p. 10.

" God—in the divine Nature of Jesus; and the Peo-
" ple in all the fulness of their Number—in the Man
" who is God's Fellow, or the human Nature of Christ;
" are—peacefully met together in the God Man; who
" hath taken into himself the FULLNESS of both Na-
" tures, in the Unity of *One Person*." p. 4.

" We were perfected together with Him as the
" FULLNESS in the Mystery of HIS HUMANITY."
Hymn Book, preface p. 11.

3. That therefore this Union of two Natures in one
Person is the very Covenant between God and his
People.

" God and Man—are brought together by Cove-
" nant Relation in Christ Jesus—whose Covenant con-
" sists in the Unity of TWO NATURES, but ONE PER-
" SON, in our Myfterious Immanuel, or God with us."

p. 3.

" The Conditions are fulfilled in the same—as it
" consists in the PERSONAL ONENESS of both Na-
" tures." p. 4.

" Having

“ Having our Mystical or spiritual Being and Existence in his Humanity, and with Him in God.”

“ —It is this which has raised our NATURE to an eternal Sonship.” p. 15.

4. This Notion of Christ's Humanity assumed of the Virgin being or containing in it self the whole Church, you therefore describe as our *Life, Righteousness, Holiness, Peace, Victory and Rest*. The Assertions of this, form the Body of your Discourse.

“ The Eternal Father has in *this Union* cultivated our spoiled NATURE—His collected Mystical Body the Church,—Healed it by his Stripes, AND WE IN THAT NATURE AS MEMBERS THEREOF—raised IT from the Dunghill to a Glorious Throne, Angels admiring, adoring, and willingly flying to execute HIS Commands.” p. 4. 5. 7. 8.

“ It was here (you affirm) the Soul that finn'd, died, —and in this Sense the Soul that finned was punished.” *Salv. Compl.* p. 4.—being IN HIMSELF the SINNER and the SIN.” *Hymn Book, pref.* p. 9.

“ That this Nature thus purged and born of God might be incapable of Sinning; and answer in full conformity to the Purity of the Godhead.” p. 10.

These Quotations are enough to manifest I have not mistook you, and now if your main Assertion must fall to the Ground, all the rest falls with it; and then the real Gospel Blessings and Benefits which you borrow, to hide and adorn your Scheme, will be return'd to their right Owner, I mean the proper Union of Christ and his Church.

That “ in the Person of Jesus there are two Natures, God and Man” is a Point that we are agreed in as a Truth. But that this human Nature assumed of the Virgin is in it self the whole Church or any part of the Church but the Head, must be denied. I attend therefore to the Scripture Proof you bring for this confident Assertion, and misleading Scheme.

You

You say "the Word speaks of our being Circumcised in Him, of being crucified with Him, and of being risen with Him." *Hymn Book pref. p. 9.*

It does so, and what then? Cannot this be by the Persons of his People being united to his Person as their Head and represented in Him as their Substitute? Is there any Necessity from this for the absurd Supposition that they are the very Humanity or human Nature assumed of the Virgin? Cannot Jesus in his Sufferings and Bloodshedding be the Spirit, Mystery, and Antitype of Circumcision in the Letter, Covering, and Type? Cannot Jesus be the Head Suffering to cleanse the whole Body? Cannot we be circumcised in Him and rise with Him in Virtue of the Union of our Persons with his Person? Cannot he in this Relation to us be our Substitute, and Surety, or as the Scripture says, be made under the Law, to redeem them that were under the Law? and does not all this plainly intimate the very reverse to your Supposition?

But "we are Members of his Body, of his Flesh, and of his Bones." This no more infers your wild Assertion than the former. Does not Adam say of Eve *this is Flesh of my Flesh, and Bone of my Bone*, and had they not nevertheless distinct Humanities? so that the one was not the other, neither was one contain'd in the other in this Sense, for the Original of Eve in Adam was a Rib, and not a Person. Or if we should (according to the Jewish Dream) suppose her a Person, then it still follows there are two Persons however join'd together.

But you will say is not "Christ our mysterious Immanuel; or God with us; where the offended and offending Natures meeting together make but one Christ?" *Salvat. Compl. p. 3.*

No, the Scripture is quite against your Interpretation, and asserts a Mediator where God and MEN meet. God and MEN do not immediately come together

ther but there is one Mediator between God and Man
 THE MAN Christ Jesus. 1 Tim. 2. 5.

Again you say "the Union of Natures in Him is
 " that Marriage Union where our Maker is our Hus-
 " band."

The Scriptures are here again quite opposite to your Interpretation, and assert the Divine and human Nature united in the Person of Christ, to be the Bridegroom of the Church; in distinction from the Persons who constitute the Bride. The Bride is therefore called the LAMB'S Wife, the Lamb that was slain, that is plainly the Humanity of Christ---therefore to assert that the Marriage Union of Christ and his Church consists in the Union of Natures in Christ, is directly contrary to the Scope and Design of these Scriptures.

" It was here (you observe) THE SOUL that sinned
 " dyed---and in this Sense THE SOUL that sinned was
 " punish'd --Being IN HIMSELF the Sinner and the
 " Sin."

Here you suppose your Scheme removes a grand Difficulty, by making Christ the very Soul that sinned, supposing it would otherwise be unjust to punish Him. I shall therefore first shew, that Christ can be no other Soul or Person but Himself, otherwise then as the Substitute and Surety so containing the Persons of his mystical Members, Children of his Covenant, or Seed begotten, or to be begotten of his Word of Truth. And, 2dly, that we stand in need of no such Assistance as this Scheme to solve the difficulty.

1. Nothing is more apparently false than the Supposition that Christ is any other identical Person than Himself alone, for in that respect that he is Himself, he cannot possibly be any other self, than Himself. I may as well affirm that this Sheet of Paper is another Sheet, or any apparent Contradiction whatever. And here I cannot see that you have any Alternative but either with us to acknowledge that Christ as partaking
 of

of Flesh and Blood is but a single Man, and that it is by another and farther Constitution that he is made a Root or second Adam unto a People who are brought into a new State of existence in Him by his Gospel Truth, and to whom he stands related as a Covenant Head, Surety, Substitute or Representative, or to maintain your wild Assertions you must farther suppose, that Christ's Humanity is constituted or contains an Extract, or Essence of human Kind, somehow analogous to what is obtained by a chymical Process; so that by this Supposition the Church is Mankind extracted into the Humanity of Christ. This unscriptural Supposition, though it may gloss your Assertions, yet at the same Time, it in fact annihilates yourself and all Mankind. For suppose Millions of living Individuals were put into a Vessel and distilled off into one living Creature, tho' you might call that living Creature by the Name of the Millions that it was extracted from, yet it is not really any one of them, nor any one of them that new living Creature, the Existence of one is the Destruction of the other. And the whole of such a Supposition brings us but into the old State and real condition of the Sadduce or Epicure, *let us eat and drink for to morrow we die*, there is no Resurrection of us, who are here; we are only the *Dregs* of the Vessel, he that ever lives is Jesus the *Extract*; so then we are to die and be no more, as the Beast that perish; but the Humanity of Christ will live for ever.

If to avoid this Conclusion you admit that we shall have our Existence continued, to behold and enjoy our Exaltation in this Humanity of Christ; (or, as I would express it, to *behold his GLORY and be like Him*) then you are come round again where you should be, to the denial of your main Assertion. Christ in his Humanity is allowed in Fact, not to be the whole Church, or any part, but the Person of the exalted Head, and

we

we the Persons * called the Bride, the Lamb's Wife, rejoicing in Him our Glory. Such is the vain Labour of self Inventions, and departing from the plain Revelation of God.

But you have one Answer left, and that is "as to those who would be judging of inexplicable Mysteries, you are content to be censured and mistaken of them," and you have as you think sufficiently furnish'd your Peculiarities with the word Mystery as to
secure

* *A Person, or a personal Existence, is not an Idea or abstract Notion, or Quality, but a Being only, which is capable of Life, and Action, of Happiness or Misery. Therefore it is apparently ridiculous to suppose our PERSONS are really in Heaven while we have self-Evidence our Persons are here. As the High-Priest entered the Holy of Holies bearing the Tribes of Israel as their Representative, so Jesus bears us in the Heaven of Heavens, untill the Time of the Consummation of all Things, and then (in the most proper and full Sense) we who are now conscious of existence here, shall be presented before the Throne by Jesus, according to those words, Behold, I, and the Children whom thou hast given me.*

By Sameness of a Person we understand Same in a strict Sense, such a Sameness as cannot subsist with Diversity of Substance, that is, the Person of whose Existence the Consciousness is felt now, and was felt an Hour, or a Year ago, is discern'd to be not two Persons, but one and the same Person; and therefore is one and the same. Every Person is conscious, that he is now the same Person, or Self, he was, as far back as his Remembrance reaches: since when any one reflects on a past Action of his own, he is just as certain of the Person who did that Action, namely Himself, the Person who now reflects upon it, as he is certain that the Action was at all done. Here then we can go no farther, for it is ridiculous to attempt to prove any thing more plain than one's own Existence.

secure your Scheme from an Examination, or your self from being obliged to defend it. But to this I would observe, that a Mystery is a *Truth* whether I can comprehend it as it is or no. Therefore what I can really comprehend to be a Falsity cannot be a Truth. Hence the Papist though he brings the Words of Scripture to me *This is my Body* cannot prevail, by using the word Mystery, to make me Believe that the Bread in the Communion is the very Identical Body of Christ: because I find it remains still the Thing I call Bread, and the Thing I call Bread can no more be the Thing I call Flesh, than a Cork can be a Horse. But in as much as these are the Words of Scripture, I pay a regard to them, and believe that they are the Shell or outside Expression of a Truth contain'd under them. as if a Man should say of the Deeds and Writings of an Estate, this is such a Farm or Manor, I cannot understand the Parchment Writing to be a Farm or Manor. Nevertheless there is Truth contain'd in his Meaning by those Words, the Sign being put for the Thing signified. But you have not so much as *this* to support your Mystery, you are obliged to explain away the Scriptures from a plain and obvious Sense to support your Scheme, and have none that so much as express it as you would have it understood; which you must produce before you can stand upon a level with the Papist, and after all that it will not do, though helpt out by the word Mystery. A Mystery always signifies a Truth, sometimes contained as a Kernel in a Shell, and sometimes with the Shell broke. The Mystery or Truth of the Levitical Sacrifices was Christ's Atonement: That Shell is now broke and done away. The Mystery of the Father, Word, and Holy Ghost, one God, and yet as properly Three, is a Truth as yet unexplain'd, or a Mystery inclosed. But if a Person was to affirm from those Words that Three was One in the very same Respect; that is, that the one God was

was three Gods, He would not hold forth a Mystery or Truth, but an apparent Falsity and Contradiction. But as Three in one Respect may be One in another Respect, it may be a Truth that God so exists. And as the Scriptures declare it in such Terms as it may be a Truth; we believe it is a Truth in those Terms; tho' the particular Nature of this Existence is an incomprehensible Truth or Mystery hid under the Words. The same may be said of the two other Unions mention'd p. 8. and here observe the Artifice of Satan, taking these Scripture Mysteries from our use, and giving us some of his own to deceive and pervert us. But to return,

2. We stand in need of no such Help as this, to remove the Objections that may be raised from the Sentence *the Soul that sins shall die*; for what though the Law lays the Sinner under the primary Obligation to satisfy Justice, cannot the sovereign Lawgiver provide a Method of more fully displaying and satisfying his own Justice, in Harmony with his other infinite Perfections? Is there any thing in Sin by the Law * that

B

is

* *Sin in the Law Sense, is the Failure of Obedience, Fault, or moral Contrariety to the Law: for as to the bare Act as such without this moral Contrariety, it is not Sin; all killing is not Sin, but only that which contain a Moral Contrariety to the Law. -- Those Actions and Dispositions that are gross Sins in Men are not so in Brutes, because as they are no moral Subjects, their Actions are not capable of this moral Failure. --- The forbidden Act or Fact is also transient, past, and gone out of Existence with the past Moment. All that does, or can remain on the Sinner's Person, and Conscience, is the Guilt or Fault of the Failure of Obedience subjecting the Bearer of it to proper Punishment. Now it is allow'd that the natural part of the Act which ceases to*
be

is inconsistent with transferment from the original Contractor (of the obligation to satisfy Justice) to another that Voluntarily bears the legal Fault or Demerit? The Scripture informs us that, *The Lord laid on Him the Iniquity of us all.*---that *He bare our Sins*---suffer'd for us the *Just for the Unjust*---so that *He who knew no Sin*, in a natural Sense, was *made Sin for us* in a law Sense, *that we might be made the Righteousness of God in Him.* And our Sins originally, became his by a divine Transmision that he might be punish'd or satisfy Justice for them. There is not one of these Scriptures but what is directly against your Assertion that *CHRIST is the Sinner Himself*; they all express, and imply, that he is not the original Transgressor, but bears them as *oyns* in that sense; and *his* only as he bears them for *us*. The pretended Injustice of this Procedure is removed, by its being the Redeemer's voluntary Undertaking, and its being a Satisfaction to Justice is declared by the divine Good-pleasure in it.---Besides who can say he has such a thorough Idea of the Nature of the Union of the Redeemer's Person with the Persons of his People, as to be able to find Fault with this Proceedure. The Husband is one with his Wife, and the Surety one with the Debtor in Law, without losing the Identity of their Persons; and can you or any one say, that a Union of Persons with the Person of the Redeemer cannot subsist (unto all the ends the Scripture have assigned) without your Whim? The Scriptures inform us it does; and that the Sins of our Persons the Members are transferr'd to the Person of the Head, *Christ*,
that

be with the present Moment, as well as the depraved Disposition, is proper only to the Agent or original Subject; and not transferrable; but it is the moral Failure of Obedience, or Sin by the Law, that was laid on the Person of Jesus in the behalf of the Persons of his Members or People.

that he may satisfy Justice for them; and the Righteousness of the Head, becomes the Cloathing or Righteousness of the Members, that we may enjoy all the Advantages of it, without any Confusion of Persons or necessity of making *Christ* the Soul that sinned. If to help out your Assertion, you was to bring in *Christ* for a Soul that sinned in Adam, as a Son of Adam; this also would prove unprofitable for your Point, for in that respect, his Satisfaction must be for his own Person, and not for the Persons of his Members; otherwise than by the divine Transferral we plead for.

You frequently assert our being in Christ, as "being the Constitution and Fulness of his Humanity." If by this you mean Christ in his Humanity assumed of the Virgin is really the whole Church, that is (as has been already shew'd) an apparent Falsity, and therefore no Mystery.---If to come off, you say you mean that Christ is not the whole Church really in his identical Person, but (by divine Constitution and Appointment) contains the Church in Him only as the high Priest did the Tribes of Israel; when he went in before the Lord; and therefore is by this Constitution what he is NOT in his identical Person; then you have given up your Mystery, and it appears that Christ is really but one single Person in himself, but is constituted the Substitute or Representative of the Persons of his Members, the Church, or Christ mystical. Or if by "our being the Constitution and Fulness of his Humanity" you was to say you mean that his Person, or Humanity assumed of the Virgin, is only a *Part* of which we are the *Whole*, then you have again given up all. For by this it will appear, that this human Nature assumed of the Virgin, is in fact not the Church, or any part of the Church, but the Head; nor does or can this Humanity contain in ITSELF his mystical Body, or the Persons of his Members, otherwise than as the Head and Substitute representing them.

But

But after all, I am rather apt to imagine that you would have your Disciples think it is so, upon your confident Affirmation; and without examining whether it can be so or no, very submissively let you draw the Curtain over all, by the frequent Use of the Word Mystery. Them that will not submit to this, you leave to lower Dispensations, and to the Care and Trouble of thinking for themselves. But them that are of a more pliant Disposition, and will but closely attend to those profound *Depths* you have found out, they will no doubt, one day or other, find a Happiness in another of your principal Points, which you often aim to establish throughout the Whole of your Writings, *viz.* "That our NATURE is healed by his Stripes, and we " IN THAT NATURE as MEMBERS thereof". Here you must give me leave to observe, that MEMBERS OF A NATURE is no Scriptural Phrase, and besides, it is most unmeaning and egregious Non-sense. Human NATURE is but an abstract general Term, and what is meant by it has no Existence by itself, as *Human Nature*, but only in particular Individuals. The Term Human Nature, stands for a Collection of Properties that are to be found in every Individual of the Human Race, and accordingly those Properties, are called *Mens. Natural* Properties. When we say our Lord assumed the Human Nature, we mean properly, he assumed all the Properties appertaining to an Individual of the Human Race; if you would represent him as assuming more than this, it must be Persons, or Individuals by Union and Substitution, for he had ALL the Properties of Human Nature in himself as becoming one Individual. And now, how shall I understand your Sentence, "Our Nature is healed by his Stripes, and we in that " Nature as Members thereof". Shall I understand you, "Our human Properties were healed by his, " Stripes, and we in those Properties as Members, " there-

“ thereof ”. Is not this Nonsense ? Well, shall I understand you, “ Our Persons were healed by his Stripes, “ and we in those Persons, as Members thereof ”. Nonsense again.. Did you ever hear such Nonsense, as “ *Healing a Nature* ”, or, as being “ *Members of a Nature* ” ? *Healing of Persons*, is Sense ; being *Members of a Community*, or *Body of Persons*, is Sense ; and being a *Partaker of human Nature*, or of the Properties of an Individual of the human Race, is also Sense ; but your Sentence has no proper Sense belonging to it. Now, as you affirm your Doctrine to be so immensely Deep, as to exceed the Penetration of Persons of lower Dispensations ; I think it is incumbent upon you either to give it us in Scripture Phrases, or if you will give us your own Words, let us have good common *English*, and not such Bombast and Jargon as no Man ever put together that pretended to be an Author. This is the more necessary as it may be affirm’d from a close Examination of what you have wrote hitherto, that the Whole of the Mysteries you deal in, does not lye in the *Things* you seem to treat of, but intirely in the Nonsense, and uncertain Sound of your *Phrases*. Whereby to the Reader, who imagines you are treating of *Things*, and so overlooks your Words, you seem to be treating of some deep Matter, beyond his Understanding ; whereas the true Reason is only that “ Nonsense never can be understood ”. But to another kind of a Reader, that will not make himself happy in inventing some Meaning to your invented Phrases, when he has considered them in all possible Ways they will bear, he finds them quite ambiguous, and uncertain ; and the *Things* you would establish by them to be no Mystery, but what can be immediately discerned downright Absurdity, and Inconsistence *. That this

B 3

is

* Observe, I am to be understood of those Points in your Writings, which you so diligently cover with the Word
Mys-

is not a Charge without Proof appears from many other Places, as well as the Sentence we are considering; for instance, how uncertain and ambiguous is your Sense of the general Term *Nature*. In your Sermon, *Salvation Completed*, you say, "The Covenant consists in the Unity of NATURES but one Person" p. 3. "The Conditions are fulfilled in the Personal Oneness of both NATURES"; p. 4. "In this Covenant our NATURE laid Waste by Sin, is now become a fruitful Field", p. 7. "In this Covenant our NATURE is raised from the Dunghill to a glorious Throne", p. 8. "It is this which has raised our NATURE to an Eternal Sonship", p. 15. "Our NATURE is in Peace with God; and in that NATURE, every one of us as Members thereof". p. 27. "The Offended and Offending NATURES are here brought together in the Unity of one Person", p. 30. "In which NATURE of his we being made Sons", p. 34. "That this NATURE thus purged and Born of God, might be incapable of Sinning", Hymn Book, Pref. p. 9, 10. "Our NATURE was regenerated and born anew in Christ Jesus". Tryal of Spirit. p. 19. What must I understand

Mystery. After which, (your supposed Mystery being admitted) you proceed for many Pages, inferring what is True when applied (not to your Whim) but to the real Mysteries of the Gospel; for instance, in your Sermon, *Salvation Comp.*, p. 3. Having asserted, that the Covenant consists in the Unity of two Natures in one Person. Then you run on, that here is our Life, Righteousness, Holiness, &c. which would all be True, if applied to the TRUE Union of Christ and his Church. But at the same Time is absolutely false of your Notion. By this Means there is a grand Deception imposed on your unwary Readers, or Hearers.

derstand by the Term, Nature? Must I understand the *Collection of human Properties* common to each Individual, or *every Individual* on account of those Properties; or must I suppose that there is such a *natural necessary Connection* between every Individual having those human Properties, that what may be predicated of one, may be predicated of all? Or must I only suppose that there is *such a Connection between some* Individuals having these Properties, that it is true only of them? According to the first Sense, every Sentence above mention'd is nothing but Jargon that means nothing. In the Second, I must understand the **WHOLE HUMAN RACE** to be the very Person of Christ, on a glorious Throne in eternal Sonship, and incapable of Sinning. According to the third Sense, I am to suppose a Connection which is evidently false; for instance, would it not be false, to suppose Mr. Relly's Blunders are mine, because he partakes of the same Nature with me; or, that my Corrections of them, are his, because I partake of the same Nature with him? According to the last Sense, every one of the Sentences above are denied; for then the Covenant does not consist in the Unity of Natures in the one Person of Christ, but in some other Union of those particular Individuals with him as their Head. Again, in respect of your ambiguous use of the Word Body; whereby it is uncertain whether you mean *natural Body*, consisting in no more than one Person, or *mystical Body*, consisting of all these Persons, who are united to the Person of Christ their Head. For instance, you say, Sermon p. 4. "The mystical Constitution of his Humanity, was fallen Man, who are therefore considered as Members of his BODY". Take Body in which Sense we will here it will not do, for if we understand the BODY assumed of the Virgin, then, as has been proved, fallen Man, or the fallen Sons of Adam, cannot be considered

ed as Members of it, nor any ways interested in it but by Union, and Representation. If we are to understand mystical Body or Persons united to Christ as the Head, then his Humanity assumed of the Virgin can only be in itself the Head of such a Body, and only answer for such a Body by representing the Members.

Again, " All who know their Membership in the " Body of Christ", p. 8. " What Jesus is in himself, that are we. after the Mystery of our being " in his Body", Hymn Book, Pref. p. 11. If this is to be understood of his natural Body, it is senseless Jargon, for none can be in the Body of Christ in that Sense; in that sense he must necessarily only be a Substitute for his Members. If it is to be understood of the mystical Body or Union of Persons, it will bear, but then the Mystery falls to the Ground, and you come to a plain Allowance of Union of the Persons of the Members with the Person of the Head, implying some other Bond of Union than you have described.

In your Hymn Book, p. 64. you abuse the Scripture Sense, by playing thus with the Word *Body*.

Thou, Lord, a BODY didst prepare,

Thine own collected SEED.

I think I cannot make this Abuse more manifest, than by giving you at once a View of this Scripture in its true and also in that false Reading that you would impose upon it; as follows. Heb. x. ver. 4. For it is not possible, that the Blood of Bulls and of Goats, should take away Sins, ver. 5. Wherefore when *He* cometh into the World, he saith, Sacrifice and Offering thou wouldst not, but a Body, that is, a (natural) *Body* hast thou prepared ME, says the divine WORD. A *Body*, that is, a *collected Seed*, says Mr. Rely, ver. 9. Then said he, Lo, I come to do thy Will O God, ver.

ver. 10. By the which Will we are Sanctified through the Offering of the (natural Body) of Jesus Christ. In your Reading it must be we are Sanctified through the Offering of the *Collected Seed* of Jesus Christ. This is not receiving Instruction from the Scriptures, but in order to prop up your invented Scheme, an attempting to model the Scripture to it, by changing the proper Sense of the Word *Body* in this place, into your Absurdity. The which being demonstrated inconsistent already, I need say no more to it. By a like usage of the Word *Body*, you (in fact) say *the Resurrection is past already, overthrowing the Faith of some*, as HYMENEUS and PHILETUS did. Where in p. 10. *Salvation Comp.* you introduce the Words of the Prophet, "Thy dead Men shall live, together with my dead Body shall THEY arise", to support your Scheme, if you understand this Sentence of Christ's dead Body, as the Head rising in the Room and Stead of the Members, and as a Pledge and Pattern of their Resurrection in the due Time, who are interested in Him, you would understand a Truth: But as you would have it understood that his dead Body was the whole Church, or contained it IN ITSELF, it is apparently false. For we are yet here, and not risen from the Dead, in that Sense; but on the contrary wait for it. If we who now are on Earth are the Persons spoken of under the Word THEY, then the Words are necessarily to be understood of Christ's Substitution for his Members, and their rising with him in that Substitution; then it is also evident we could be so crucified with him as well as risen with Him, though not Personally present. If we who are on Earth are not those Persons intended by the Word, THEY, but it speaks of a Church personally in Christ, who are all gone already into Heaven with him; then this Scripture is none of our Concern; and as for poor us left behind,

behind, as we find ourselves Subjects capable of eternal Happiness or Misery, since Christ is gone in Heaven with all his Church personally, we must despair of Happiness, and can only expect to escape Misery by some comfortable Supposition that *we* (the Dreggs of the Vessel) shall be annihilated. But then you must prove this Annihilation by Scripture, or you leave us in the utmost Danger, if it should not be so. For while you are comfortably telling the People, *THEY* or somebody called *THEY*, are Dead, and Risen, and gone to Heaven; not barely in the poor low Sense of Substitution or Representation, but *PERSONALLY* gone in the Humanity of Christ; and, "They in that Nature as Members thereof"; or, "As the Constitution and Fulness of that Humanity"; and that *the, us, or we*, that are here upon Earth, will by and by, be done away, annihilated and gone; and therefore is not at all to be the Matter of our Concern as to a future State. If we should find to our eternal Mistake, that we here left below are not annihilated, but must live for ever, it will be but poor Comfort to us, to say Mr. *Relly* told us so; or to think there is somebody called *us* that is very Happy in the Humanity of *Christ*. The Scripture informs us that the very identical Soul of the Thief that was Crucified with *Jesus*, was with *Jesus* in Paradise; and *Paul* judged when he that was upon Earth, once a Pharisee, afterwards a Christian, should be absent from the Body, *he*, the same *he* should be present with the Lord; and though we drop our Corruption and Depravity with our vile Bodies, yet even *they* shall be changed and fashioned like unto the glorious Body of *Jesus*. And if these Scriptures are true, where is the Foundation for your Scheme, or Sense of the Scriptures? How unhappily and dreadfully are these poor Souls deceived, who build their claim to Christ on a

Propo-

Proposition that is not common Sense. " Our Nature
 " is Healed by his Stripes, and we are in that Nature
 " as Members thereof". If universal Salvation were
 a Truth, we might as well do without any Religion at
 all as with that which is founded in Absurdity, and
 Falsehood. We may as well embrace one Falsity as
 another, it is equally the same in the End. Deists,
 Mahometans, or Papists are as much in the Right, as
 these who embrace such absurd Notions about the Hu-
 manity of Christ; nor is their *present* Happiness con-
 cerned more in one than another of these Opinions, for
 add universal Salvation to any of them, it will make
 them all equally Happy. And if universal Salvation
 is not a Truth, they are all equally deluded. You
 may perhaps say, why do I meddle with universal Sal-
 vation, you have not declared yourself on that Head?
 May be not, yet as you leave your Reader to suppose
 a Meaning for you, it is the only Supposition they
 have got left, who cannot suppose their whole real
 Existence to be in the single Humanity of Christ, and
 themselves *as Persons* to be annihilated. For they must
 suppose you mean. " Our Nature, i. e. Mankind in
 " all Persons partaking human Properties are healed
 " by his Stripes, and we in that Nature are included
 " in Christ's Humanity as Members thereof". That
 is, as partakers of the common Nature of Man, and
 that we " Are therefore considered as Members of
 " Christ's mystical Body, as being human Creatures."
 Now if this is true, that we are Members of Christ's
 mystical Body, as being human Creatures, then it must
 be true that all human Creatures are so. If it is not
 true that all human Creatures are so, but only some;
 then it is certain that these some who are the Mem-
 bers of Christ's mystical Body, stand in some other
 union and relation to Christ, than barely being human
 Creatures, for all Mankind are that. And it is false

to suppose that we are thus interested in Christ, as being "Members, or rather Partakers of the human Nature," or that we are on this account, "Considered as Members of his Body". And therefore every one who claims his Interest in Christ, as a Member of his mystical Body, barely on this account, that he is a human Creature, must have universal Salvation of necessity as a Prop to his Claim. If it is said, it is those human Creatures who believe their Union in Christ, that are the united Members of Christ. This supposes some Foundation in the Word for such a Perswasion. And if it is not universal Union, and Salvation, it must be a Grant of Christ to Sinners, or which is the same Thing, a Declaration that whosoever believeth on him, shall not be Disappointed, shall not Perish, but have everlasting Life. Then the Object of Faith is not so properly *I am United to Christ*, as this, *Christ is given in the Gospel to Sinners*, with a Declaration, that whosoever believeth on him, or receives him as such a Gift shall not be disappointed, *I therefore lay claim to him and all his fulness, on this divine Warrant and Grant.* And as Faith is such a Perswasion of the Truth, and such a Reception of Christ as this, it is not, nor cannot be in its Nature a Condition, or Work, but assures the Soul of Salvation without any other Condition than *Christ given to me, as the Lord my Righteousness.* It assures the Soul of Salvation by Christ alone, without waiting for a Sight of its own Act. Now if all this is allowed, the whole Debate is at an End. The Scripture Language and Doctrine stands consistent without the Necessity of Inventing any Schemes to make an Object for Faith. Which Schemes after all must be believed, or rather fancied by the misled Disciple, before any Happiness from a supposed Enjoyment can follow. Now that universal Union, or universal Salvation is not a Truth, appears to me from the Scriptures

tures plainly testifying the Contrary in many Places. So that the same Authority as I have for believing that there is any such thing as Salvation, testifies also of *everlasting Destruction to some, from the Presence of the Lord, and the Glory of his Power; and of Vessels of Wrath fitted to Destruction.* As to any Arguments from the Goodness of God, we are no Judges of it, farther than the Scripture declares; what would be good in us, in many instances would not be so in him. Besides, any argument for universal Salvation drawn from the supposed Goodness of God, have the same Force against the Necessity of Christ's Sufferings or Atonement, for if it would any ways impeach the Goodness of God to punish for Sins with everlasting Destruction Men of the brightest and most amiable Character among Mankind, then Christ has dyed for nothing; for he has dyed only under that Wrath which properly belongs to Man, without any Impeachment of any of his divine Perfections. So that while we are pleading against the Propriety of everlasting Damnation for Sin, we are pleading proportionably against the Propriety of Christ's Sufferings. In like manner any Argument drawn from the Sufficiency of Christ's Atonement is Inconclusive; for what have we to do with the Sufficiency of Christ's Atonement, to judge farther from it than the Scriptures have declared, either in regard to the *Persons who shall*, or the *Method whereby* they shall be benefited by it. We might as well judge that God's Power was not sufficient to have prevented the Fall of Angels, and of Men, because he did not prevent it. We cannot deny but his Power is sufficient to bring to pass a thousand Things, which nevertheless he does not see fit to bring to pass. Therefore we must not pretend from our Notions of Christ's Sufficiency, any more than from our Notions of God's Power, to be wiser than what is Written.

Upon the Whole, to suppose Christ's natural Body is constituted the Representative of his mystical Body, or the Persons of his People, is consistent; and the hidden Mystery of the UNION lies where the Scripture hath placed it, viz. IN THE PRECISE NATURE OF THE ONENESS of *One Person*, the Head, with the *many Persons* of the Members.

But leaving this which is a scriptural Account, implying no Contradiction, to suppose the Nature of the Union to consist in Christ's natural Body, containing IN ITSELF the whole Church; or to suppose it is so, the *Extract* or *Composition* of us or ourselves, that we are PERSONALLY entered in his Humanity, "into all that fulness of Rest and Glory, which he "is entered into, and abide with him and in him "there for ever"; while we find ourselves Personally here, and therefore have self-evidence that we can be only in Heaven by *Substitution*, until we come there in *Person*; this is such an' apparent Contradiction as can never be relieved by the Word Mystery. If we are Personally in Heaven, our Personality on Earth cannot be the same Person that is in Heaven, no more than two Things can be one in the same Sense. And as we find that the Person here below is a Subject capable of Happiness or Misery, this Person ought to be the Subject of our Concern, and not an imaginary Person which we suppose we have elsewhere. It is this Person we are conscious of, that has sinned, that passes from Death to eternal Life in Christ, or else must be punished with everlasting Destruction from the Presence of the Lord. It is we that are the Subjects of God's Revelation. You must bring some Arguments to prove that we are not ourselves, if you can, or that we shall be Annihilated; or else your Mystery wants another main Prop, besides that of universal Salvation.

If

If Christ's Humanity is not the Church, then "the Covenant does not consist in the Unity of Natures in ONE PERSON."—Then the Conditions are not fulfilled in the PERSONAL ONENESS of both Natures, and so on. Hence it is plain I have not mistook you.

The evil of your Scheme is, it leads us from the plain Declarations of Scripture, insinuates a false and foundationless claim to ONENESS with Christ, that is, as being partakers of the human Nature, it prevents our claiming with that true Claim that stands founded upon God's Faithfulness in his Word, and in fact under the Name of Religion, leaves us destitute of what is true Religion. By embracing a Falsity, we are defrauded of a Truth, and are as effectually robbed of the Scriptures, that is, of the proper Use and Intent of them, as if they had never been written, or we had never heard of the Name of Christ. For if I suppose him to be what he is not,—lay my claim to Him by a Relation that does not really subsist,—and understand the Scriptures in a Sense contrary to their real Meaning—am I not in reality without Revelation? and in reality reduced to the State of the most savage Heathen, or rather worse; in as much as they do not prefer Satan's Lie to the Truth of the Gospel, whereby is inherited the greater Condemnation.

I add no more, but that I sincerely wish you may be converted from the Error of your Way, and no more rob the Scriptures of their Simplicity and Plainness. And am, in this desire,

Yours,

W. CUDWORTH.

P O S T S C R I P T.

I had almost forgot an extraordinary Sense you have put on the Parable, of the Vine, *John xv. 1.* to support your Scheme, *Trial of Spirits, p. 55. 56.* you say, "as the Branches were NATURALLY in the Vine before a Sprout appeared; so were his Children (i. e. his Humanity) in Him," if we thus naturally existed in the divine Nature before Creation, we must be God himself. Nor did we *naturally* exist in the Humanity of Christ. Christ as a Man, is a Sprout of the Vine *Adam, the SEED or OFFSPRING of DAVID according to the Flesh.* As God Man, second Adam, he becomes the Root of *David*, and of all his People; not contain'd in his *Flesh*, his *Rib*, or his *Loyns*, but contain'd in him as the Children of his Purpose, Covenant, and Gospel Truth. Again you say, "as in the fulness of Time, the Vine puts forth its Branches in order to bear Fruit; so did he, bring forth his Children (i. e. his Humanity) into Existence." His Humanity is not his Children, his Children are brought into their Existence as such, by the Gospel Word; afterwards you tell us a strange Story of the Vine bearing Fruit UPON the Branches; when every Body knows, that it bears Fruit by the Sap arising into the Branches, and fructifying them. Your Labour here is to destroy the scriptural Doctrine of the Imputation of Righteousness unto us, by your Scheme. Our Saviour's Intention was, to inform his Disciples that HE was the true Vine, and THEY the Branches; such Branches as being in him like Scions, or Grafts, the Husbandman after a Season, visits; and takes away the un-united, as *Judas*, and purges the United. For the Proof of this, I refer you to the plain Language of the Parable itself.

A
L E T T E R
T O

Mr. *John Wesley.*

S I R,

IT is now some years since you gave up this controversy you now revive : I think you should have been so ingenuous as to have inform'd your readers of what you left unanswer'd, or at least the real state of the matter as you left it, and given some present reply : But as you have not done this, you cannot blame me for doing it, as follows :

An EXTRACT from two DIALOGUES between a preacher of inherent righteousness (as the condition of acceptance with God) and a preacher of God's righteousness revealed from faith to faith.

(From the Address prefix'd.)

— The giving of scandalous names, such as Antinomian, or the like, has no warrant from scripture, and appears to men of sense but a mean way of making good the cause one is engaged in ; and though I have a precedent for such a practice in your dialogue, yet as our Saviour bids me not return railing for railing, I therefore have chose you such a name in the following dialogue, viz. a preacher of inherent righteousness, as I believe you entirely approve of, and have taken to myself a name I as much approve of, endeavouring herein to do as I would be done by — From

(From DIALOGUE I.)

* G. R. What do you mean by saying, *that Christ by that one offering of his on the cross, made a full satisfaction for the sins of the whole world?* page 2 †.

I. R. I mean only, *that Christ did then put away the punishment of all our sins, who believe in him,* p. 10.

G. R. If you are right, then, this as been my mistake all the while, for I thought that Christ had not put away, but had endured the punishment, that thereby he might put away *our sin*, and the scripture has confirm'd me in this, by saying, that the Lord laid *on him* the iniquity of us all, and therefore he was wounded for our transgressions, and by his stripes we are healed, Isa. liii. He is the Lamb of God that *taketh away the sins* of the world, John i. 29.

I. R. Did he then heal the wound before it was made? and put an end to our sins before they had a beginning? p. 2.

G. R. No, no; the wound was receiv'd long before our sins had their beginning, in the fall of Adam. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous, Rom. v. 9. He put an end to our sins, as charged upon him, before they had a beginning in us, who have been born since, as well as for them who were born before.

* G. R. stands for Preacher of God's Righteousness, &c. and I. R. for Preacher of Inherent Righteousness, &c,

† The Words in Italick, are chiefly taken from Mr. Wesley's Dialogue. The Letter p. signifies the page in the Original Dialogue. P. p. signifies the page in his late Book called a Preservative.

[From Dialogue II.]

I. R. Christ hath redeemed us (all that believe) from the Curse or Punishment justly due to our past Transgressions of God's Law, and by the same Merit of that one Sacrifice, then applied to the Conscience when we believe, he redeems us from those which are to come, p. 5. P. p. 201.

G. R. I must have an Exception against the Word Merit, because you do not explain what you mean by it. The Merit of Christ's Sacrifice is an unscriptural Term, and often made use of by the enemies of the Gospel, to serve their evasive Purposes; bring one Scripture to prove, that we are redeemed by the Merit of Christ's Sacrifice, and I will allow it you.

I. R. What are we redeemed by then?

G. R. By Christ himself, he is made of God to us Redemption, 1 Cor. i. 30. by the Sacrifice itself, he hath redeemed us to God by his Blood, Rev. v. 9. and when we believe we receive, and are made Partakers of Christ himself, John i. 12. Heb. iii. 14. not merely his Merits, and all his Merits are ours of Consequence, because he himself is ours, and his Sacrifice ours, and when we speak of his one Sacrifice, we know what we are speaking of; but when we speak of the Merits of it, you possibly may mean one Thing and I another.

I. R. What then do you mean by the Merit of his Sacrifice?

G. R. First, then, according to the Scriptures, we ourselves, who believe in him, are the Merit of his Sacrifice, he hath bought, and redeemed us by his Blood, out of the Hands of all our Enemies; again, he merited for us by his one Sacrifice a Discharge from Sin, that no Sin of ours should be laid to our Charge, Rom. iv. 2. 24.—viii. 33, 34. Imputed to us, iv. 6, 7, 8. or remembered any more, Heb. x. 17. So that

there need no more offering for Sin, ver. 18. but we are perfect for ever by that one Offering, *Heb. x. 10, 14.* merited by his one Sacrifice, a Deliverance from the Law, *Rom. vii. 6.* 1 *Cor. xv. 57.* from Condemnation, *Rom. viii. 1.* he merited for us an Imputation of perfect Righteousness, without Works, *Rom. iv. 6.* he merited by his one Sacrifice, an Entrance into the holiest, *Heb. x. 19.* If this is your Meaning, I understand what you say, *that Christ redeemed us from Sins which are to come, by the Merit of that one Sacrifice,* that is, by the Discharge from Sin, Non-imputation of Sin, &c. which he hath obtained in his own Person for us; further, *that the Merit of that one Sacrifice* (i.e. discharge from Sin, Non-Imputation of Sin, &c.) *is applied to the Conscience* when we believe, so that then it is applied to the Conscience, that Christ's Discharge from Imputation of Sin is ours, and that none of our Sins are laid to our Charge, imputed to us, or remembered any more, &c. all this I allow of, and it does not contradict, but confirm those Scriptures, which testify, that Christ made an End, put away, and finish'd our Sin (as charged upon him) that it might be thus imputed, and applied to us.

J. R. But I say, *he redeems us from Punishment,* you do not find me saying, Christ bears, or puts away Sin.

G. R. I find, that tho' you would fain hide yourself, you are not found at the Bottom. You do not believe that Christ hath borne Sin *. The Scripture saith, Christ bare our Sins; now Punishment can't be called Sin; Punishment is such, no otherwise than as it is the Wages of Sin; and when Sin is not charged, there is

* See what is Sin by the Law, what is Sin as transferrable to Jesus Christ, in the Letter to Mr. Relley in the Note, p. 17.

no Wages due, and therefore, if you mean by Christ's redeeming us from the Punishment, Christ suffering without having the Sin, our Sin charged upon him, it is no Punishment, but bare Sufferings; and Christ's Sufferings, if our Sins had not been laid on him as the Cause, would have been of no more Use to us, than the Sufferings of one of the Martyrs; but the Scripture says, he bare the Sins of many, *Isa. liii, 12.* and therefore, by his Stripes, or being punished, they are healed, *1 Pet. ii. 24.*

I. R. I believe, he made (by that one Oblation of himself once offered) a full and perfect, and sufficient Sacrifice, Oblation and Satisfaction for the Sins of the whole World, p. 4.

*G. R. Unless Sin be taken away Justice is not satisfied—the Law will have the Sinner, or the Sin taken away; therefore the Damned suffer on continually because they cannot take away Sin by Suffering; but Christ did more than suffer, He put an End to Sin by the Sacrifice of Himself. Again, it is said that He made us perfect for ever by that one Sacrifice, which could not be, if by that Sacrifice he did not purge away our Sins, *Heb. i. 3.* Again, if the Sacrifice of Christ did not put away Sin, it would not be a perfect Sacrifice, more than the Blood of Bulls and Goats, *Heb. x. 4, 9, 26* †. The Fault of Sin is separable from the Person of the Sinner, but can never be separated from the Punishment it deserves. *David's* Person is freed from the Fault of Murder, but his Murder can't be freed from the Desert of Death: Now that which Christ did especially, was to make us without Fault before God, and this he did by bearing our Sins. We read in the Scripture of God's sepa-*

† See this more enlarged in the original 2d Dialogue, p. 37, 38, 39.

rating our Sins from us as far as the East is from the West, *Pf. ciii. 12.* but we don't read of separating the Fault or Sin from the Punishment, they always go together, therefore it was, that when Christ took our Sins upon him, the Law laid hold of him, or he was made under the Law, in order to Punishment, and thus was delivered for our Offences, and raised again for our Justification, *Rom. iv. 25.* It is essential to a Mediator to reconcile the Parties at Variance; now Christ our Mediator might save one Party from utter Ruin by bearing Punishment, yet cannot reconcile them both without taking away all matter of Offence: God is not offended at the Creature because he must be punish'd, but because it is he who hath broke his Law, and therefore he punisheth him.

(From DIALOGUE II.)

I. R. I believe Christ has only redeem'd us (*who believe*) from the punishment due to our past transgressions.

G. R. Then who must redeem us from those which are to come; if this doctrine were true, it wou'd bring you and I under a sad condition. The scripture says, there remains *no more* sacrifice for sins, *Heb. x. 26.* The blood of *Jesus Christ* cleanseth us from *all* sin, *1 John i. 7.*

To which I now add, There is no Time with God; what is future and contingent with us, is ever present and certain with him. And therefore all the Sins of the Persons yet to come, as well as the Sins of the Persons before discharged in Virtue of Christ's coming, could be at once laid upon him, at once atoned for by him, and he at once receive a full Discharge from them in his Resurrection. The Lord in his own eternal Mind waits not for the Event of Time, he can as well (to speak after the Manner of Men) collect fu-
ture

ture Sins, as remember past Transgressions. So also in Respect of the Discharge from Sin, Christ as a second Adam when he rose from the Dead, received the Discharge of all his People or spiritual Seed. This does not infer against *Abraham, David, &c.* having their personal Discharge long before, in Virtue of this Discharge in Christ to come. Nor by the same Rule does it infer, that Christ cannot keep this Discharge in himself until the Time we need it, and exist the *capable* and *declared* Subjects of it, as Children of the Second Adam. And according to this View, let us come into personal Existence either before Christ's bearing Sin, and receiving a Discharge from it, or after, it matters not. Christ is the *declared* personal Subject in whom our Sin terminates as to Atonement, and we are the proper personal Subjects in whom the Discharge terminates according to the divine Declaration. And, as respecting Time, *Abraham's* Sin waited till Christ came, so the Discharge in Christ waits till we come into Existence, as the proper personal-Subject in whom it terminates. And tho' there is no Time with God, yet there is an Order in the divine Mind equivalent thereto, whereby the same Person is beheld, condemn'd, aton'd for, and discharg'd, and all respective of the different Times in which it successively comes to pass.

I have said thus much, in order to manifest from this evidently false Supposition, that *future Things cannot be present with God.* You and *James Rely* draw the different erroneous Assertions, whereby you perplex the Minds of the Unwary, and corrupt the Plainness and Simplicity of the Scriptures. You assert that *Sin and its Condemnation, cannot be put away by Christ before it is committed.* I answer it can according to the Order in the divine Mind with whom *Futurities* are present and certain. Says, *Mr. Rely*, the Scriptures affirm, that Christ has bore Sin and its Condemnation already,
therefore

therefore there can be now no sin or condemnation but only in our consciences, for want of knowing better. I answer him, this does not follow, but on the contrary, because the *futurities* of our sin and condemnation in the divine mind are *realities*; therefore when they come to pass in time, they are *real* and not bear fancies in the conscience, for want of knowing better. The Discharge from sin was real to Christ (*i. e.* from real sin and condemnation) because *FUTURITIES present in God's mind, are REALITIES in their future existence.* The discharge which was thus *real* to Christ, is given to us in the gospel, *Acts* x. 43.—xiii. 38, 39. and our receiving this remission as a free gift, as on the one hand it can be no condition, so on the other hand, it is more than a bare manifestation to our consciences, even the *reception* of a real discharge, made so by the faithfulness of God in giving it according to his declaration.

And as Christ could *thus at once* bare sin *past* and *future*, without destroying its *reality* in its respective moment of existence, so we may (thro' divine grace) *receive at once*, a discharge from *sin past* and *future*, without at all infringing upon its *reality* in its respective moment of existence. Hence also it appears, that (in different respects) we may be every moment real sinners, yet every moment from our first partaking of Christ compleatly justified in *the Lord our righteousness.* And your assertion to Mr. —, that, "there may be as many *degrees* in the *favour* as in the image of "God," wants proof.

I. R. The blood of Christ makes an atonement, for the sake of which * God forgives, p. 11.

* That is, as a meritorious procuring cause, for the sake of which we are justified by the righteousness of our repentance and faith; this is what you mean in opposition to
 bringing

G. R. According to the constant language of the Holy Ghost, we have our forgiveness *in* his blood, and not merely for the sake of it: but, pray, who are made partakers of *this* remote forgiveness?

I. R. Those that perform the *condition* of believing, *that Christ has not done all which was necessary for our absolute salvation; but, that he has done all which was necessary for your conditional salvation.* See the short view of the difference between the Moravian Brethren and Mr. Wesley, p. 14.

G. R. Then the condition of forgiveness, is to believe, *that Christ has done all that was necessary to procure a conditional salvation.*

As far as I can see, this faith leaves you just in the same state it found you, *i. e.* still having the *condition* to perform *; and then all you have said about *Christ's full satisfaction*, p. 2. and *his having loved us, and given himself for us*, p. 3. amounts just to nothing at all, for a conditional forgiveness is no forgiveness; it is no more than the offer of a bargain to any that will come to the terms. It is no more in reality, than if having offer'd to let my house, by a public advertisement, for so much money, I should then say I have let my house to all the men in London.

I. R. Say what you will, it is plain to me, that notwithstanding all that Christ hath done, he that believeth not shall be damned, Short view, p. 14.

G. R. That is true, but it is he that believeth not that Christ hath done all which was necessary for his

being justified by the perfect obedience of Christ, as appears by your letter to Mr. —, p. 218. of the Preservative.

* Therefore your scheme contradicts itself, your faith is the condition, and yet leaves you the condition to perform.

D

absolute

absolute salvation †. And this faith is only necessary in order to *receive* the *forgiveness* in the blood of *Jesus*, not to procure it by way of *condition*.

To which I add, when I have performed all conditions, I must receive *that* which I perform'd the conditions for: when a man has wrought for his wages, he must after all *receive* his wages, and if he has twice the sum given him by a free gift, he does not call the *receiving* it a condition. If you should reply, his *receiving* it is the condition of his having it, I answer, I may as well say his *knowing* it to be *given* him is a condition of his receiving it; and its being *given* him is a condition of his knowing it to be *given* him; there is no end of such conditions as these; these are only the *orderly dependance* of one thing upon another; sometimes express'd conditionally barely to shew their connection. A proper condition has but two parts, that is, the *condition*, and the *promise* made upon the performance of the condition, whereby the thing promised becomes a *due debt* to the performer; and let the Thing required be little or more, it is meritorious of the covenant reward promised. The agreement makes it so. Now when it is said, *he that believes shall be saved*, it is because the object of his faith, or the Saviour believed on, saves him, and not because his act entitles him to salvation; for the record to be believed is, that *God hath given to us eternal life in his son; He that hath the son hath life, and he that hath not the son hath not life, but the wrath of God abideth on him.* The plain truth is this, I am saved, that is, the *matter*, or what I am saved by, is what Christ has already done and

† Absolute as opposed to conditional, or having any condition to perform. Christ has left us no such conditions.

and obtained, and that alone. But *I am saved*, that is, the *Method* whereby I am made a partaker of salvation, in what Christ has already done and obtain'd, is not by doing something to entitle me to it, but by grace thro' faith, that is, by *receiving* what Christ has already done and obtain'd, as a *free gift*. It is thus of faith that it may be by grace (without condition) and that (by this means) the promise might be *sure*, as depending upon no previous condition to be perform'd.

Here again Mr. *Relly* and you agree in one common principle of error. You both falsely suppose, "that what Christ hath done and obtain'd, hath its whole effect without any such method of conveyance." Hence you are both obliged to consider faith in a different light, and give it another office than the scriptures ever intended. You apprehend it to be a proper condition, and the office of it to be, to believe that your salvation is conditional; which is an apparent inconsistency.

Mr. *Relly* divides the matter, and where, in the scripture, mention is made of believing, he understands it to be a condition which Christ has perform'd for us. And in regard of any office which faith might be supposed to have, he has supplied the want of that, by what he calls *INTELLIGENCE*, *consciousness*, *feeling their membership*, &c. by which he intends their being persuaded that his *word* is as true as the bible. This is the belief he seeks to establish, as you do a belief of a conditional salvation, and wherever either of you prevail, God's saving truth is deny'd; and the real salvation of the Son of God, is trampled under foot.

And yet how plausible does your doctrine seem! when asking yourself (in p. 201. of your *Preservative*) what you trust in for justification and salvation, you answer,

D 2 " In

" In the alone Merits of Christ which are mine, if
 " I truly believe that *he loved me, and gave himself for*
 " *me.*"

Who would think that the poison of asps lay here !
 But, to an understanding reader, by this sentence, you
 make *your faith the condition of Christ's merits*, which is
 making God a liar, in all those declarations intimating
 Christ and his righteousness as the free gift of God, to
 be *received* by faith, without the previous performance
 of any condition whatever.

If you had said, that you had trusted in the alone
 merits of Christ, as really given to you in the gospel,
 and that *that* was your faith, you had spoke like one
 that knew what faith in Christ was : But to say you
 trust in the ALONE merits of Christ, *which are yours if*
you perform a certain condition, is what we may call a
catechresis, or perhaps more properly, tho' vulgarly,
 a *bull*. Your real meaning is, you trust in *your perfor-*
mance of the condition which you suppose required, for
 take away that, and you have no proper object of
 trust left.

You describe your faith in the apostolic language,
 that *he loved me and gave himself for me* ; but don't im-
 pose upon your readers ; let it be remembred, you
 don't mean he loved you so, as to bestow upon you
freely himself, and all his fulness to be only *received* by
 faith. But he loved you, so as to obtain for you that
 you should have liberty to save yourself by performing
 the conditions of salvation ; that is, to vacate the *old*
law, and bring in a *new law*, which is that most dan-
 gerous doctrinal Antinomianism, which leavens all
 you write in the eyes of judicious readers. Now ob-
 serve, Sir, I am not throwing dirt at random, and
 barely calling you Antinomian, but am proving the
 real Antinomianism of your doctrine, and it is out of
 your power, without you deny your principles, to
 deny the charge.

As

As the rest of the *new-law Antinomians* do, so you seem to speak at first, as tho' faith was the only condition; afterwards you come in with other conditions of *repentance*, and *new obedience*, and all to be continued to the end by the way of condition; there being with you "as many degrees in the favour of God" as in the image of God." And this you say the apostle taught the *Gentiles* in *Acts* xxvi. ver. 17, 18. before they were justified. I could not believe a man capable of giving such a false turn to the Scriptures, did I not see it with my eyes. Does not *Paul* relate (as you have allowed) that our Lord sent him as a witness, TO OPEN THEIR EYES that they may receive forgiveness of sins, (and not perform conditions for it) and not only receive forgiveness, but also receive inheritance among them which are sanctified (not for, but) BY faith which is in me. To which we may add what the same apostle says on the same subject in *Rom.* iii. 5. To him that worketh not (performeth no condition) but believeth on him that justifieth the Ungodly. Is it not plain then, that the repentance and works meet for repentance this same apostle spake of, were undoubtedly respective of this free salvation without works, and not to be performed by way of previous condition. Such repentance as *Paul* himself stood in need of, while he was seeking salvation (as it were) by the works of the law, and such as you yourself now stand in need of, if your writings are the language of your heart.

But to return to your common principle or false supposition, whereby both you, and *Mr. Relly*, agree to oppose the true faith of Christ. You infer, that since it is said, notwithstanding all that Christ has done, He that believeth shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned; faith is properly conditional, and the death of Christ has only obtained this new bargain. This I must deny, and as to the proper and plain meaning of the words, I distinguish between

saved, as it means the *matter of salvation*, or *righteousness* we are saved by; and *saved* as it intends being made a *partaker* and *possessor* of that which saves. *He that believeth* (i.e. receiveth Christ and salvation in him as a free gift) *shall be saved* (shall be made a partaker of salvation by him) *be that believeth not* (that neglecteth or rejecteth this free given salvation) *shall perish*, under the just sentence of the law he is under, with this additional aggravation of his guilt.

On the other hand, Mr. Rely, being convinc'd that neither he nor you have perform'd these supposed conditions, as they should have been perform'd, no more than you have kept the moral law, very justly infers, that neither he nor you have any hopes of being saved, by your personal performance of these conditions. But being as unacquainted as you are with that faith which *receives* salvation as a free gift without condition, and at the same time rightly judging that Christ has perform'd all conditions for us; he infers, that Christ has believed and repented for us; and therefore we must understand those words, *be that believeth shall be saved*, as fulfilled in Christ. And in this you so far agree with him, as to assert in your letter to the author of *Theron* and *Aspasio*, "that if Christ perform'd all that was conditional for you, he repented and believed for you." Pre. p. 223. I answer both you and him, that Christ has perform'd all that was conditional, and that the faith mention'd in the gospel is therefore only to *receive* Christ and salvation in him, as a free gift, as above-mention'd: And in this sense, as faith is a receiving Christ, and salvation in him, unto the end of a personal participation and enjoyment; Christ could no more *believe* for us, than one man can eat, drink, or take physic for another. Again, if faith only receives that which saves, it is thereby evident, that it is neither a condition, nor properly any part of that which saves, as my eating is evidently no part of the food I

am

am nourish'd by. Should it still be replied, then you are not made a partaker of salvation alone by what Christ has *already done* but by a *something more*, that is, unless you *receive* it? I acknowledge that is true, nor unless you exist, nor unless Christ is given to you that you may believe on him, nor unless you are overcome in your corrupt obstinacy, in not submitting to this way of salvation alone by what Christ has already done. These particulars are all some way or other necessary to your being a partaker of *salvation* alone by what Christ has already done; and therefore can be no contradiction, or denial of it. Should it be further replied, if *I am saved by that which Christ hath already done, it is already done, whether I receive it or no.* That is true, and what then? *Then I am saved whether I receive it or no.* This does not follow, unless you first prove, that we *are saved* by what Christ has already done, without ever partaking of it: Or that our *personal* salvation does not at all consist in our partaking of what Christ has already done.

Understand *saved* by what Christ has already done, to mean *the matter that saves*; and its true I am *saved by that*, without waiting for *something more* he has left me to do. But understand it *saved*, that is, made a *partaker of salvation*, and then it must be affirm'd, that in my being a *partaker of salvation*, it is necessary that I personally exist, &c. as above-mentioned. If the law condemns me not, I have no occasion for Christ; if I sin not, the law condemns me not; if I exist not, I sin not: So, if *I believe not I am condemn'd already*, because if I receive not Christ, I am without the only matter that saves, or him in whom salvation is. If he has not done and suffer'd sufficiently, he cannot be a sufficient Saviour: If he is not given, he cannot be received: If receiving lie upon the condition of giving, then receiving is not the condition of giving, &c. From the whole thus considered, it appears,

pears, that faith is no work, no proper condition, no saving righteousness, no part of salvation, nothing to help out what Christ has done, but is *only* and *wholly* concern'd in our partaking of it in this life ; and the declaration, *he that believeth shall be saved*, evidently imports, a warrant to *receive* Christ as our compleat salvation ; a promise that we shall not be disappointed in thus receiving him, and also a declaration of who are manifestly those persons, who are eventually saved by his death, but import no proper condition whatever.

[From Dialogue II. p. 40.]

J. R. You allowed in our former Conversation, “ that faith is necessary in order to RECEIVE forgiveness or salvation ; this is the whole of what I mean “ by terming it a condition,” p. 6. P. p. 201.

I did let this concession pass before, but I must not now. I deny that it is the *whole*, or any *part* of what you mean by terming faith a condition. You say, “ the TERMS OF ACCEPTANCE for fallen man, are re- “ pentance and faith, and what Christ hath done is not “ the term or condition of justification ; that fallen man “ is justified, not by perfect obedience, but by faith ; that “ faith (in this sense, that is, in its own act) is imputed “ for righteousness ; that there are as many degrees in the “ favour as in the image of God,” p. 215. Is this no more than receiving forgiveness or salvation ? What a shift was this to come off by, instead of proving your point ; and how little reason have you to add, “ but “ why do you fight about a word ? especially after I “ have told you, find me a better, and I will lay this “ aside,” p. 6. P. p. 201.

G. R. The Holy Ghost has words enough to convey his own meaning (*to receive a free gift* conveys the scripture sense, tho’ not your sense) and therefore we need not coin new ones ; especially when they are of danger-

dangerous signification; besides, your faith being to believe that salvation is conditional, and faith itself that condition of your salvation, appears to me to be a circle, in which your faith is always running after your salvation, and your salvation after your faith.

[From Dialogue I. p. 7.]

I. R. "How is it that you say, that a Minister of Christ ought to preach nothing but believe, believe! and that to tell men of doing any thing, is preaching the Law," p. 4. P. p. 202.

G. R. Here you widely mistake us; we affirm constantly, that they which have believed should be careful to maintain good works.

I. R. You maintain, also, that a believer is free from the law?

G. R. As it is a covenant of life or death, he is entirely free, Rom. vii. 4. He is not under it; as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse, Gal. iii. 10. Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth, Rom. x. 4.

I. R. Do you mean the Law of God?

G. R. I mean the law of commandments, Eph. ii. 5. That law which is holy, just, and good, Rom. vii. 12.

I. R. "So your liberty is a liberty to disobey God." Short view, &c. p. 15. P. p. 195.

G. R. Our liberty is to walk in the Spirit, and not fulfil the deeds of the flesh; we are at liberty both from the law and the flesh.*

G. R. But

* Our liberty from the law and the flesh, are understood to go together. In the sense that we are yet in the flesh, the law charges us with sin, which, as our sin, has been answered for by Christ, who has received the discharge in himself. By the Truth, Christ given in that Truth, and Christ receiv'd and enjoy'd by faith in that Truth, we enjoy

L. R. But how does this agree with those words of our Lord, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled," Matth. v. 17, 18. P, p. 203.

G. R. It entirely agrees with this text, for our Saviour has fulfilled every jot and tittle of the law in the body of his flesh, and has took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross, Col. ii. 14.

L. R. The apostle means "only the Jewish dispensation, the law of ceremonies," p. 5. R. *ibid.*

G. R. It was the hand-writing of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us. The ceremonial part of the law was for us, the remission of sins was contain'd therein. Again, it was that law which cursed us, for he was made a curse for us. The ceremonial part did not curse us.

L. R. I
joy liberty from the law, and (that state called) the flesh together; and this state is the state called the spirit in opposition to it. Each state has its fruits, and the fruits of the new state are such as are liable to no exception. The law with all its curses and appendages, are here apprehended to go together. The new state enjoy'd by faith here, and by sight hereafter, is also understood with all its appurtenances flesh and law, liberty and spirit. Hence many seeming contradictions are reconciled, by applying each scripture to the state it refers to; for instance, 1 John iii. 8, 9. may be understood of the same identical be, or we, mentioned, chap. i. ver. 8. only considered according to those different states of the old and new man. Here also Antinomianism, or denial of the law, is entirely avoided, it is kept in its full force and place, but cannot touch the new man: This is what Luther intends by the law belonging to the flesh, what Mr. Marshal means in his 12th direction.

I. R. I am resolved not to understand it in that sense ; don't we read in Gal. v. 5, " *When the fulness of time was come, God sent forth his son, made under the law, of the Jewish dispensation, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons,*" p. 5. P. *ibid.*

G. R. So then according to your exposition of this scripture, neither Jew nor Gentile are redeem'd from the fall ; Christ being made only under the Jewish dispensation, or law of ceremonies, to redeem the Jews from that dispensation, and the Gentiles are not at all the better for his coming.

I. R. Hold, hold, you go too far.

G. R. Nay it must be so, if what you say is right, for we are redeem'd only from under that law Christ was under.

I. R. Is it not said, 1 Cor. ix, 21. *that we are under the law to Christ,* p. 5.

G. R. I wonder that you who have been so curious about the original of several texts, have been so neglectful here. The Greek word is *ἐν νόμῳ* in a law, (i. e. the law of love and liberty) not under the law.

(From DIALOGUE III. p. 40.)

I. R. " *But you have not true faith, unless your faith worketh by love,*" p. 6. P. p. 195.

G. R. That is true, true faith worketh by love, if doth not work by the law.

I. R. How ! not work by the law ? doth not the law command love ?

G. R. Very true ; but we do not love because the law commands it, but because Christ hath first loved us.

I. R. " *But do you infer, that because our Lord fulfilled every jot and tittle of the law, that therefore he has destroyed the law ?*" p. 9. P. p. 195. 203.

G. R. No, I believe the law is still in full force to them that are under it ; but Christ is become the end

end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth, *Rom. x. 4.*

I. R. "He put an end to the Mosaic dispensation,"
"p. 6.

G. R. Do you mean by the Mosaic or Jewish dispensation the ceremonial law only.

I. R. I mean the Jewish dispensation, *the moral (as well as the ceremonial) law*, p. 7.

G. R. Then, according to your own words, Christ is the end of the moral as well as ceremonial law, for righteousness to every one that believeth.

I. R. You will always have Christ to be our righteousness; my divinity is, that *faith is counted for righteousness to every one that believeth, in virtue of a better covenant establish'd by Christ, who put an end to the Mosaic dispensation*, p. 6, 7.

G. R. And don't you add some works to this faith in the matter of justification, according to this better covenant you speak of.

I. R. Not any works antecedent to, or independent on faith in Christ, p. 7.

G. R. But works that are after, and dependant upon your sort of faith. I now think I am got to the bottom of your divinity, which is, if I mistake not, that *Christ has establish'd a better covenant, as you call it, in the room of the Jewish dispensation, in virtue of which, faith in Christ, as a conditional Saviour, establishing a conditional salvation for us, and the works we do from believing our salvation conditional, are what we are to seek to be justified by.*—The Lord have mercy upon you, and upon them that hear you, and grant that you may never stand before him in judgment according to this doctrine, for if you do, you will certainly perish. I beseech you in this great fundamental point, hear the doctrine of the homilies of the church of England, which you profess to be a member of. "It pleased our

' our heavenly Father to prepare for us (say the *boni-*
 ' *lists*) the most precious jewels of Christ's body and
 ' blood, whereby our ransom might be fully paid,
 ' the law fulfilled, and his justice satisfied, so that
 ' Christ is now the righteousness of all them that truly
 ' believe in him, *he for them paid their ransom by his*
 ' *death, he for them fulfilled the law in his life!* so that
 ' now in him, and by him, every true christian may be
 ' called a fulfiller of the law.' The first part of the
 sermon of salvation, *fol. 15.* — ' This doctrine advan-
 ' ceth and setteth forth the true glory of Christ, and
 ' beateth down the vain glory of man. This who so-
 ' ever denieth, is not to be accounted for a christian
 ' man, nor for a setter forth of Christ's glory, but for
 ' an adversary to Christ and his gospel, and for a set-
 ' ter forth of man's vain glory.' Second Part of the
 sermon of salvation, *fol. 16.* — ' So that the true un-
 derstanding of this doctrine, we be justified freely by
 ' faith without works; or, that we be justified by faith
 ' in Christ only, is not this, that our own act to be-
 ' lieve in Christ, or this our faith in Christ, which is
 ' within us, doth justify us, and deserve our justifica-
 ' tion unto us (for that were to count ourselves justified
 ' by some act or virtue that is within ourselves)—St.
 ' *John* the Baptist, in this matter of forgiving sin, he
 ' did put the people from him, saying, behold *yonder*
 ' is the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the
 ' world! Even so, our faith in Christ saith unto us
 ' thus, It is not I that take away your sins, but it is
 ' Christ only, and to him only I send you for that pur-
 ' pose; forsaking therein all your virtues, and only
 ' putting your trust in Christ.' *fol. 17, 18.* See these
 quotations more at large in the original Dialogue, p. 40.

I. R. But doth not the scripture mention *faith be-*
ing counted for righteousness?

G. R. Not in opposition to Christ being our righ-
 teousness.

teousness. The faith the apostle speaks of, lays hold of the righteousness of another, *Rom. iv. 21.* Faith is imputed for righteousness only as it fetches in Christ's righteousness. My receiving a diamond with my hand from a friend, as a gift, may make me worth a thousand pounds, but 'tis properly the friend's gift, the diamond that enriches me, and not merely the taking it into my hand. The righteousness of faith is not the righteousness of its own act, but *the righteousness of Christ, the righteousness of God.* It is said, *by the obedience of one* (i. e. Christ) *shall many be made righteous,* *Rom. v. 19.* and therefore not by my act of believing, as considered in itself, but I am made the righteousness of God *in him,* *2 Cor. v. 21.* Nor is that believing good for any thing, or profitable to us, that doth not apprehend Christ himself to be our complete righteousness, without the consideration of any thing performed by us, or wrought in us. Faith is compared in the scripture to eating, and Christ to bread, meat, &c. *John vi. 32—58.* And faith bears the same relation to Christ, his righteousness, &c. as eating doth to meat, bread, &c. and 'tis as much folly for any one to insist upon it, that faith is imputed for righteousness, and not mean thereby, that Christ on whom we believe, is our righteousness, as it would be for any one to insist upon it that he was nourish'd by eating, that did not mean thereby that the meat he eat was his nourishment.---Besides, the faith you would establish is not the faith of Christ, not the faith whereby we are born of God, not the faith the scripture makes mention of: It is true, you say, it is that Christ has loved you, and died for you, but for what purpose? to establish * a conditional salvation for you? The scripture knows

* See 1st dialogue between a preacher of inherent righteousness and a preacher of God's righteousness, page 5.

knows nothing of such a faith; when the scripture saith he that believeth shall be saved, it is he that believes that God has given to him eternal life in his Son, *Joh. v. 11.* he that believes his old man is crucified with Christ, *Rom. vi. 6.* he that believes that Christ bore his sins in his own body on the tree, *1 Pet. ii. 24.* he that believes Christ was delivered for his offences, and raised again for his justification, *Rom. iv. 25.* he that receives Christ by faith, *John i. 12.* as his righteousness, *1 Cor. i. 30.* *Jer. xxiii. 6.* he that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, *Rom. iv. 5.* and beholds him as his complete salvation. By this you may see that yours is not the faith the scripture speaks of. As your faith is, so consequently are all the fruits of it, your love, obedience, &c. is such as the gospel knows nothing of, it is only the fruit of believing in Christ as a conditional Saviour, so you love God and your neighbour as conditions of your salvation; you pray, hear, communicate, and do good works, as you call them, for fear you should be damned for not performing conditions enough; but the saints love God and their brethren, &c. because they perceive his love in laying down his life for them, *1 John iv. 19.* *iii. 16.* and being manifested to take away their sin, *1 John iii. 5.* They let not sin reign in their mortal body that they should obey it in the lusts thereof, because they are dead to it by the body of Christ, *Rom. vi. 8,---12.* because their old man is crucified with him, *v. 6.* who was made sin for them, that they might be made the righteousness of God in him, *1 Cor. vi. 31.* and so they serve in newness of life, *Rom. vi. 4.* as those that are alive to God from the dead, *v. 13.* raised from the dead in him, who is their resurrection and their life, *John xi. 25.* as those that are washed from all their sins in his blood, *Rev. i. 5.* as those that are sanctified and justified in his

his name, *1 Cor. vi. 11.* as those that are made meet for the inheritance of the saints in light, *Col. i. 12.* as those that, without works, are new created in Christ Jesus unto good works, *Eph. ii. 10.* as those that are saved and called with a holy calling, not according to their works, but according to his own purpose and grace, *2 Tim. i. 9.* as those that are sons of God, *1 John iii. 1.* and heirs of heaven, *Eph. i. 5.—15.* and expect, at the end of their labours the reward of the inheritance, the reward that comes by heirship, and not the reward that is obtain'd by the conditions they perform; and because they are bought with the price of his blood, glorify him in their bodies and spirits, which are his, *1 Pet. i. 18, 19. 1 Cor. vi. 20.* And thus you may see, Sir, the works you would establish are no more the works of believers, according to the scripture account, no more the works of the children of God, than your faith is. May the Lord give you deeply to consider this in time, that you may no longer go on to establish such faith and works as have not the king's image and superscription on.

J. R. I thank you; but let's proceed: You seem'd not to approve of my calling you an *Antinomian*, and reckon'd it a scandalous name; the reason I gave it you was, *I thought it was properly your own, for it meant one who speaks against the law, p. 3.*

G. R. I am very glad you have no other reason for calling me so, for the name is generally understood to signify one that gives himself up to licentious practices; and as to the charge, it is the same that the Jews laid against the apostle *Paul*, therefore I may more contentedly bear it, and can say with him, Dowe make void the law through faith? God forbid! we establish the law, *Rom. iii. Pr. p. 202, 215.*

J. R. How do you establish the law?

G. R. We hold the law to be a ministry of condemnation, and that is establishing the law. If we held it to

to be a ministry of righteousness, we should make it void.

I. R. How so?

G. R. By putting it where it can't abide and be useful—If you were to put a lighted candle to the roof of your house, it must soon be removed, or it would set your house on fire, but put it on a table, and it may there abide and be useful; so the law put in its proper place, to give the knowledge of sin, *Rom.* iii. 20. and be a ministry of condemnation, *2 Cor.* iii. 9. where God has designed it to continue, and be establish'd, there it may abide and be useful; but as a ministry of righteousness and life it cannot be established, but is made void. So also good works, and all the scriptures which speak concerning them, put in their proper places, are establish'd, but put out of their place are made void; their place is not justification or salvation, as appears from *Rom.* iv. 5. To him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, &c. and *Eph.* ii. 8, 9. By grace ye are saved through faith—not of works, lest any man should boast, *Tit.* iii. 5. But their place is after salvation, *Eph.* ii. 10. being created in Christ unto good works, *Tit.* iii. 8. These things I will that thou affirm constantly, that they which have believed in God, might be careful to maintain good works; these things are good and profitable to men.

I. R. Well, however this may be, surely your account of sanctification is the most crude and indigested I have ever yet heard, p. 9.

G. R. How so?

I. R. First you say, that that is a false faith which men are obliged to support by frames, feelings, and works, p. 9.

G. R. So I do still, what then?

I. R. Then you allow, that whoever has true faith, is holy both in heart and life, p. 9.

G. R. That is also true.

I. R. Then you have abundantly confuted yourself, for you have allowed that true faith not only cannot be supported, but cannot exist without the love of God, and of all mankind, p. 10.

G. R. There is so wide a difference between what supports faith, and what is the effect of faith, that I wonder a person that never lays his reason aside, p. 3. should mistake here. The effect of the sun is light and heat, is the sun therefore supported by light and heat? The effect of true faith is my love to God and man, but the support of true faith is God's love to me, manifested in the blood of Christ and free promise of God. The apostle saith *faith worketh by love*; but to conclude, therefore, that faith is supported by (my) love (to God and man) is a very false inference.

I. R. "You say we are not made good, or holy, by any inward qualities and dispositions." Pr. p. 205.

G. R. It is true, we are not.

I. R. "No! are we not made good by inward goodness, holy by inward holiness, meek by inward meekness, gentle by inward gentleness?" p. 11. *ibid.*

G. R. No; we may be denominated so from these fruits, and philosophers may maintain that we are so from these things, because they can see no further; but in the language of the Holy Ghost, these things are only the fruits of the spirit, and not our holiness.

"And are not all these, if they are any thing at all, inward qualities or dispositions?" Pr. p. 208.

Ans. The question is not whether these are inward qualities, but whether these things make us holy? or whether we have not a new creation unto these things as fruits, *Eph. ii. 10.*

But, "observe we are not speaking of justification but sanctification," p. 208.

Ans.

Ans. It is allow'd, and still the question is, whether we are made holy by these things ? or, whether justification as terminated in the conscience, is not an influential principle to all these fruits ; and observe, I mean not justification in your sense, but the real gospel justification.

The question is, which way is this bad tree, *viz.* a defil'd and impure mind and conscience, to be made a good one. You say by love, meekness, gentleness, &c. I say by believing that Christ has borne my sins in his own body on the tree, and that therefore they are *not imputed*, but that the righteousness of God is imputed to me *without works*, Rom. iv. 6. by believing this my conscience becomes purged, and perfected, as tho' I had not committed sin ; and such a purged conscience is capable of serving the living God, and bears forth the fruit of love, joy, peace, &c. it is therefore as absurd to say of such persons, that they are made good by their goodness, meek by their meekness, gentle by their gentleness, &c. as it would be to say of a tree, that they are made apple-trees by their apples, pear-trees by their pears, plum-trees by their plumbs, &c.

And after all we place not any perfection in victory we obtain, but in the victory he obtain'd upon the cross ; we place not our sinless perfection in our not having sin, but in its being not imputed.

J. R. I thought so, I thought you did not mean *really holy*, but *holy by imputation*, p. 11. *Pr. p.* 196.

G. R. By what spirit do you make this distinction, to say that one that is holy in Christ's blood, and God's imputation, is not *really holy* ? How dare you thus contradict the most high, and make him a liar in his word and work. I perceive plainly you know but one sort of righteousness, that is the righteousness of inherent qualities, dispositions, and works,
and

and this is the reason why the language of the Holy Ghost, and of those who by faith possess righteousness, holiness, and perfection in Christ's blood, and in God's imputation *, seems as foolishness unto you, this is the reason why, y. 16. you trifle with that scripture, Dan. ix. 24. of Christ's bringing in everlasting righteousness, which righteousness brought in 1700 years ago, is the only one in which all the saints who lived before it was brought in, and in which all to the end of the world are made righteous, holy, and perfect. Neither will the saints boast of any other perfection to all eternity; and if you, and those of the same mind with you, have the righteousness of angels, and do not renounce it, and put on this righteousness as your only covering, you will be examined with a Friend, how comest thou in hither, not having on the wedding garment! and sent away with a depart, I know you not, you workers of iniquity. I pray our Saviour therefore to reveal his righteousness in you, to the

* This is therefore a strange and wonderful definition of christian righteousness, that it is the imputation of God for righteousness. When the Popish schoolmen hear this definition, they laugh at it, for they imagine, that righteousness is a certain quality poured into the soul, and afterwards spread into all the parts of man. They cannot put away the vain imagination of reason, which teacheth that a right judgment, a good will, or a good intent, is true christian righteousness. This unspeakable gift therefore excelleth all reason, that God doth account and acknowledge him for righteous without works, which embraceth his son by faith alone, who was sent into the world, was born, suffer'd, and was crucified for us. Luther, Com. Gal. chap. iii.

perfecting

perfecting of your conscience *without works*, and then you will be truly able to sing that song of *Moses*, *Deut. xxxii. 4. he is the rock, his work is perfect*; and that song of the lamb, *Worthy is the lamb that was slain*, &c. *Rev. v. 9, 10, 12.*

I. R. As to the matter of sanctification, as you allow that a conscience purged by believing in Jesus bears forth the fruit of love, &c. you grant all I desire, p. 10.

G. R. And as you again allow that an evil mind is made a good one by believing in Jesus Christ, p. 10. you grant all I desire, if you meant believing in him as our complete salvation.

I. R. But why do you want me to speak as you do?

G. R. I do not want you to speak as I do, unless I speak as the oracles of God, and that is neither a confused way, nor an insincere way, nor an unscriptural way, nor a dangerous way of speaking, p. 11.

I. R. But I would express scriptural sense in scriptural words, p. 12.

G. R. Do so, and do not make use of the terms and phrases of philosophers, when the Holy Ghost has given us a sufficiency of expression to convey his mind, without having recourse to them. *Farewell.* But pray remember *Imputed Righteousness*, the righteousness without the law, even the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ, unto all, and upon all them that believe, for there is no difference, *Rom. iii. 21, 22.*

I. R. Well, I will just ask you one more question, and take my leave; Do you not hold, that we must lay aside our reason? *Pr. p. 200, 202.*

G. R. No; reason may be compared to fire or water, it is a very good servant, but a very bad master. *Paul*, and *Peter*, whose reasonings you instance, p. 12. made use of it as a servant, but you seem

seem to be subject to it as your master or guide. I therefore leave 1 Cor. ii. 13, 14. to your consideration.

Having thus consider'd your revival of these dialogues, and given you my additional thoughts, I conclude, desiring nothing more earnestly, than that the spirit of truth might convince you of your error, in striving so zealously against the good old Protestant doctrine, the doctrine of the church you profess yourself a member of, and the very basis of scriptural Christianity; and in this I remain,

SIR,

Your real Well-wisher,

W. CUDWORTH.

A SECOND
LETTER

T O

Mr. *John Wesley.*

OCCASION'D BY

His LETTER to the AUTHOR of
THERON and *ASPASIO*.

S I R,

I Intended to have left this matter to abler Hands; or another opportunity, but upon second thoughts, as I have been already enabled to manifest, your main argument for conditional salvation inconclusive; and as many things you have advanced are so injurious to the true grace of God, the doctrines of the reformation, and tend to mislead the unwary reader, and so far may be looked upon as a general concern; I thought I might as well cast in my mite in the present season; whereby it may appear, that if so inconsiderable an advocate for the truth can enervate what you have said, it may be justly supposed others can, whether they shall think it needful to do it or no.

Your main objections to *Theron* and *Aspasio*, seem to lie against the righteousness of Christ imputed unto justification. I shall therefore first consider them.

P. 212. You ask, "Is justification more or less, than God's pardoning and accepting a sinner thro' the merits of Christ." It is more than you intend by these words: It is accounting us righteous only for the righteousness of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, received by faith, without any intervening conditions of our own righteousness.

This phrase, "the merits of Christ," is ambiguous and not scriptural, as I have already observed to you p. 35. nevertheless, if you really meant as you have here allowed, "That God herein reckons the righteousness and obedience which Christ perform'd as our own," you would have scripture sense under the phrase, and might have spared yourself the trouble of your letter to *Aspasio*; but you think you have sufficiently reduced the sense to your own mind when you add, "they are as effectual for obtaining our salvation, as if they were our own personal Qualifications." This will not answer your purpose so much as you imagine; for if Christ's righteousness wrought out under the law, was not necessary for himself (he having a right to blessedness absolutely as the son of God *) if it was wrought out to be a meritorious cause in the sinner's justification, it is imputed as such to the person justified. Hence the obedience and righteousness of Christ, can only "be as effectual for obtaining our salvation, as if they were our own personal qualifications," by being imputed to us as our own, not inherently, but by divine grant or gift. You say, "that particular phrase, the imputed righteousness of Christ, is not scriptural †." No!

* See this proved in *Theron and Aspasio, Dial. 5. p. 238. 2d ed.* † This is the old cavil of Cardinal Bellarmine, lib. 2. ch. 7. *de justificatione, and of Socinus and his followers.* The author of *Theron and Aspasio* hath

is it not said, Rom. iv. 6. *God imputeth righteousness without works.* If you ask what righteousness, the scripture answer is, *the righteousness of God without the law,* Rom. iii. 21. *The righteousness of God, by faith of Jesus Christ unto all, and upon all them that believe,* ver. 22. So that as by ONE Man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of ONE, shall many be made righteous, chap. v. 19. even by his obedience who knew no sin, yet was made sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him, 2 Cor. v. 21. In him who of God is made unto us righteousness, 1 Cor. i. 30. and whose name is called the Lord our righteousness, Jer. xxiii. 6. These I think are scriptures enough to establish the phrase, till you disprove the thing, and we may justly expect as plain scripture for the disproof of the thing, as is now before you to support the phrase, and till you are able to do this, the phrase will not appear "unnecessary."

You say, p. 212. 215. "The frequent use of this
"unnecessary phrase has done immense hurt—it leads

F

" to

bath answered it as follows, "The very identical expression may not occur, and yet the doctrine be abundantly taught. I believe you never met with the word resurrection, in any part of the Pentateuch; nor ever read the phrase satisfaction in all the New Testament: yet our Lord fully proved the truth of the former, from the writings of Moses, and you yourself (i. e. Theron) have acknowledged the latter, to be the unanimous sense of the apostles and evangelists." To this, (of which you have taken no notice in your Preservative) he adds, "In the epistle to the Romans, we have express and repeated mention of righteousness imputed: what or whose righteousness can be the subject of this assertion? —not any

“to licentiousness†—you have had abundant proof,” but you give not one instance: besides, if you did, it would only prove that some people talk of what they don’t understand, and claim Christ’s righteousness upon a false foundation, which nobody will deny. And what is all this to the purpose to prove either the phrase, or the thing unnecessary.

P. 113. You “do not remember any such expression in scripture as satisfaction being made to the “divine law.” It is a pity you do not understand the scriptures better, than to make such objections. If *Christ was made under the law to redeem*, Gal. iv. 5. If *he was thus delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification*, Rom. iv. 25. If the *travel of Christ’s soul as an offering for sin* was satisfactory to divine justice, of which the divine law is the image or representation, I think satisfaction was made to the divine law, or he had been under it still.

Notwithstanding what you have plead against satisfaction being made to the divine law: yet presently, in p. 221, when Mr. ——— says, “by Christ’s sufferings alone the law was not satisfied;” you reply, yes it was. It should seem by this, that your spleen against *Aspasio*, or the righteousness of Christ, has the upper hand of your judgment.

The reason you here give is, “the law required only the alternative, obey or die.” Quite a mistake. The

“any righteousness of our own for it is positively declared
“to be without works. What other righteousness then
“can be meant, but the righteousness of our great SUB-
“STITUTE, SURETY and SAVIOUR. Dial. 6. p. 256.

† This is the continual objection of men unenlightened in the harmony and consistency of divine truth, who behold not the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. See this objection render’d void by *Aspasio*, Dial. 5. p. 204. Dial. 10. p. 54.

law

law requires obedience as the condition of life, *Rom. x. 5.* and threatens death in the case of disobedience. "It required no man to obey and die too". This argument of yours is Antinomianism. The law does not lose its power to command obedience, as the condition of life, because thro' man's sin, it has acquired the authority to condemn and punish. "If any man had perfectly obey'd, he would not have died:" the law would nevertheless have retain'd its power to condemn and punish, whenever any man became a transgressor. Your whole aim here is, to divide and so destroy the law, least you should be obliged to an acknowledgment of the necessity of Christ's obedience for us.

In order to manifest that there is such a distinction and *medium* between pardon of guilt, and *title* to life, that the one does not *necessarily* infer the other, *Aspasio* observes, "A rebel may be forgiven, without being restored to the dignity of a son." You reply, "a rebel against an earthly king may; but not a rebel against God." I answer, true it is so, because Christ's righteousness, active as well as passive, is imputed as the meritorious cause, and is fully sufficient to obtain both these privileges.

Theron introduces the Socinian objection, "every man is that only (and can be nothing else) which he is in himself." *Aspasio* answers it, by distinguishing between *inherent* and *imputed*; says he, "add *inherent*, and the sense becomes determinate, but the argument falls to the ground." *Theron*, replies, "I see no occasion for such *nice* distinctions." *Aspasio* returns, why then do you oblige us to make use of them?—Many writers either from an artful design, or through strange inadvertence, have jumbled and confounded these two very different ideas." You either wilfully or inadvertently understand him, as separating between the active and passive righteousness of Christ. *Aspasio* here agrees with you, that

they should not be separated, and thereby enervates all you have to say against Christ's obedience imputed; his words are, "according, to my account, it is impossible, the active, and passive obedience of Christ should be disjoin'd, as Christ in suffering obey'd, and in obeying suffer'd; so, whosoever receives Christ as an atonement, receives him also as righteousness." 2 Vol. Dial. 10. "Every true believer is interested in all Christ's righteousness." 1 Vol. p. 234. "What is implied in the condemnation of a sinner? He forfeits eternal life, and is doom'd to eternal death.—What is included in the justification of a sinner? It superceeds his obligation to punishment, and invests him with a title to happiness, both which (remission of sins and imputation of Righteousness) owe their being to Christ's obedience, embraced as active and not rejected as passive." 2 Vol. Dial. 10.

You allow, p. 212, "That Christ's universal obedience from his birth to his death is the one foundation of our hope." You say, "this is unquestionably right." In the next page you allow he was our *substitute* as to penal suffering, but deny it as to justifying obedience. Is not this inconsistency and contradiction? Don't you sometimes write and print, like a man in a dream?

I shall *zddy*, consider, those short returns you make upon the author of *Theron* and *Aspasio*, wherein you beg the matter in question, and proceed on supposing without proof, that Christ's life and death hath only obtain'd a new bargain, that we shall be justified by the righteousness of our repentance, faith, and new obedience.

P. 215. "We obey in order to our final acceptance through Christ's merits." True christians obey because they are already accepted in the beloved, and because

because they have received not only present but eternal life, in Christ Jesus, as a free gift, 1 *John* v. 12. See also p. 55.

P. 215. "There are as many degrees in the favour as in the image of God." You speak here like one unacquainted with both. See p. 54.

P. 214. "To say the righteousness which justifies, is already wrought out, is a crude unscriptural expression." Rather this of yours is a crude unscriptural assertion. The scripture says, by one man's obedience shall many be made righteous, and that obedience is already wrought out. "To say it was set on foot, carried on, and compleated, is vain Philosophy." Rather for you thus to deny it is vain cavilling.

"The plain truth is, Christ lived and tasted death, for every man." According to your account, only to obtain a bad bargain for them, by which no man can be saved.

"And through the merits of his life and death, every believer is justified." Here you impose upon your unwary reader, your meaning is, that through the merits of his life and death, every man has as much of the favour of God as of the image of God. So much work, so much wages, diametrically opposite to the gospel of Jesus Christ, and a bold setting up the covenant of works against it. Mr. H. has already told you that "the grant (of Christ and salvation in him) is made to sinners, in RECEIVING the grant, we commence believers." and hereby begin to know what the favour and image of God is.

P. 216. "Faith is imputed for righteousness." Not in distinction from Christ's being our righteousness. See this answer'd already, p. 53. and 2 V. Dial 10.

P. 216. "Will not our Lord then commend and eternally reward all kinds of beneficence, pro-

" vided they flowed from a principle of loving faith?"

Answ. Faith is the belief of THE TRUTH, implies love to that truth, and to the children of that truth, for the truth's sake. All Beneficence that has this distinguishing characteristic, manifests the subject to be *one with Christ*, and has the reward of the INHERITANCE, for they serve the Lord Christ.

P. 217. " The keeping of the commandments is " undoubtedly the *way* to, tho' not the *cause* of eternal life." Your distinction is vain and unscriptural, as far as they are the *way*, they are the *cause*; and with you the very *meritorious cause*, according to that new bargain, which you suppose Christ has procured. But there is another way than either by the old law, or by your supposed new law, which you call the Gospel, and that is by *Christ, the way, the truth, and the life.* *John 14. 6.*

P. 217. " Is the death of Christ insufficient to " *purchase* our justification?" It is sufficient for more, even to be our justifying righteousness.

P. 221. " The Terms of acceptance for fallen man are repentance and faith." What is your proof for this? "*repent and believe the gospel.*" No proof at all; *to believe the Gospel*, is to believe that God has *given* eternal life to me in his son; as a free gift without conditions, or any other terms of acceptance. To *repent*, is to be converted from your folly, in denying or neglecting this important truth. And except you thus *repent*, you shall perish with the most abandon'd profligate. See also p. 45.

P. 218, " Fallen man is justified NOT BY PERFECT OBEEDIENCE." This you say to oppose the righteousness of Christ, as our justifying righteousness. In the next page, when *Assasio* says, from *James*, " in " *many things we offend all.*" You reply, " *St. James* " does not speak of himself, or of real christians."

Arc

Are you not a most unhappy man. You seem to have such a spleen both against *the righteousness of Christ* and against *Aspasio*; that you seem inclined to say any thing to give vent to it. You assert perfection to oppose *Aspasio*, you deny perfection to oppose Christ's righteousness.

P. 218. "What Christ has done is the foundation of our justification, NOT THE TERM OR CONDITION," an unscriptural distinction, and unproved assertion. God's grace or love is the foundation, his purpose is the foundation, but what Christ has done, is the foundation, as it is the term or condition, for in the nature of the thing, it can properly have no other office.

P. 219. You charge *Aspasio* with making the holy one of God a minister of sin, in dispensing with some degrees of obedience, a most false and groundless charge, and most evidently belonging to those who say, "man is justified, not by perfect obedience." *Aspasio's* doctrine is, that none are accepted with God upon imperfect obedience; that he cannot upon any account dispense with this law; therefore Christ died, that he might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus.

P. 222. The conditions of the new covenant are *repent and believe*. Answer'd before p. 45. "To say that, *Christ performed all that was conditional in the covenant of Works*, is nothing to the purpose, for we are not talking of that but of the covenant of grace." We deny there is any such covenant of grace, as requires any works, as a condition; you must prove there is, what you have hitherto advanc'd is inconclusive, See p. 44. We say the very language is unscriptural and improper.

P. 224.

P. 224. "No scripture teaches that the holiness of Christians is to be measured by that of any Jew." The holiness of Jew, Gentile, or Christian, is to be measured by nothing but the perfect law of God. Hence it is our gospel blessing, *that we have an advocate with the Father Jesus Christ, and that he is the propitiation for our sins.* But did you mean to insinuate that we are better than they, says the Apostle, *no, in no wise, for we have before proved, that both Jew, and Gentile, are all under sin,* and even after conversion to Christ, the Apostle *doubtless counted all but dung, that he might win Christ.*

Where are those good men you speak of to be found, "who (knowing their own hearts,) do not feel disorder in their affections, who have no occasion to groan with the working of inbred corruption, who are in this sense free from sin?" When you have found these pretenders, you have found the Pharisees, like *Paul*, when to his apprehension he was touching the righteousness which is in the law, blameless; you have found the wicked emissaries of Satan, and the biggest enemies Jesus Christ has. I suppose these good men would not for the world be justified by the perfect obedience of Christ. Poor deceived creatures, they think they have no occasion for it.

But that Jesus Christ may not be quite without an office, you intimate, p. 228, that "If we were perfect, we should be encompassed with" (what the Papist's call Venial sins, but you by the softer name of) "infirmities, and liable to mistakes; from which words or actions might follow, (even though the heart was all love) which were *not exactly right.*" (very soft and tenderly express'd!) Therefore in all these respects we should have need of Christ's priestly office." This is, sir, extenuating sin, and rendering Christ's sacrifice next to nothing. Wherein appears
the

the justice of punishing the Son of God, and making him a curse for some words and actions, which deserve no stronger epithets, than they were not exactly right? O Sir, your mistake of the gospel is dreadful, who can perceive such blind leaders of the blind, without an aking heart.

P. 225. You ask, would not "the sanctification of the spirit, have more esteem, if it were a perfect work." Why don't you ask, if it would not have been better to have prevented the fall, and then there would have been no occasion for this strange doctrine about Jesus Christ; but I answer you, it is a perfect work, tho' we are imperfect during this Life. Search the scriptures, and you will be able to answer yourself. There you will find, that the sanctification of the spirit, is *by the belief of the truth.* 2 Theff. 2. 13. *Sanctifie them through thy truth, thy word is TRUTH,* John 17. 17. *For their sakes I sanctify myself that they also may be sanctified by the TRUTH,* Ver. 10. These and many more to the same purpose shew us that there is a certain *word* or *truth* concerning Jesus Christ, which when really believed, not only justifies the conscience, but creates true love, sanctifies and purges it, to serve the living God. As the moral Philosopher's strength against his corruption, lies in the force his moral motives have on his mind; as the obedience of those who are kept in by the bit and bridle of their slavish fear, bears proportion with the operation of that fear upon their minds; so the belief of the truth operates upon the christian mind, as far as it takes place. All three have the same corruption to grapple with during this life. The Christian's strength is the truth of his perfection, and completeness in Christ; which he holds during this life by FAITH, and not by *fight*, waiting for the time, when what he holds now by the bank-note of Heaven (if I may be permitted so to express it) he shall receive

receive by and by in the real cash, when he shall see as he is seen, and know as he is known. For want of an acquaintance with this real truth of Christianity, you are utterly unacquainted with what the Holy Ghost means, by the different states of old and new man, flesh and spirit, &c. And your whole view of sanctification, lies only in the prevalence of moral, or pharisaical motives, against your evil propensities. Nor can you understand any one thing about sanctification, till you love that TRUTH, which sanctifies, and opposes inbred corruption.

P. 225. Will pride make us lowly ? No ; but the knowledge of free salvation by Christ alone, in a way that suffers us to feel what we are, is the very method God has taken in this life, and is therefore above all your silly enquiries ; and this method by those that understand it, is found to throw down our religious (which is the worst of) pride, as well as other pride ; to make us “ compassionate, admire the riches of “ grace, and reconcile us to death. But how should you know any thing of this, if you never knew what it was to take God at his word, and trust yourself wholly, or without reserve, to Christ alone. You manifest the principle you are govern’d by, in observing, p. 226, on *Alpasio*’s words, “ the claims of “ the law are all answered : If so, neither God nor “ man, can claim any obedience to it.” P. 233. “ Then I am not obliged to love my neighbour, “ Christ has satisfied the law for me.” Are not these your Inferences ? Which you allow to be the quintessence of Antinomianism. Does not this plainly manifest the truth of what I have already said to you, p. 55 ? You are obliged to deny Christ satisfied the law’s demands for you, to avoid practical Antinomianism ; but he that is taught of God is under no such necessity.

" P. 228. Christ died for us and lives in us." Here you impose upon your unwary reader ; by Christ living in you, you mean no more than a moral philosopher. You mean living in you by some good thing in you, of which you apprehend he is some way the original : but according to the scripture, Christ dwells in our hearts by FAITH ; as a man may be said to have an Estate *dwell in him* as his property, by the TESTIMONY that it is really *given* to him.

P. 235. You represent Mr H—— as saying, " you cannot suppose God would enter into a fresh covenant with a rebel." Mr. H—— words are, " would enter into a fresh covenant, with an INSOLVENT and *attainted* creature." You answer, " I both suppose and know he did." And charged this INSOLVENT creature with the performance of the conditions. You may properly receive as short an answer, that you suppose and know, what is unscriptural, untrue, and absurd.

Mr. H—— says, " God made the new covenant with Christ, and charged him with the performances of the conditions." You reply, " I deny both these assertions," and acknowledge if you believed so in your view of things, it would lead you to Antinomianism ; which is a plain acknowledgement you are so in the bottom ; you are not principled with the true grace of God : you are only an Antinomian inclosed, or kept up by the fear of the law, as a bird unhatch'd within the shell.

Your concession in p. 229. is amazing, " tho' I believe he hath *lived* and *died* for me, yet I would speak very tenderly and sparingly of the former, for fear of this dreadful consequence." I think here you speak very scandalously of the grace of God in Christ Jesus : If my esteem of Christ and his gospel was to arise from your sentiments, I should take him

him for a minister of sin, and think it best to be as sparing about him in affairs of religion as possible.

P. 219. The 9th Dialogue proves excellent'y well, "that we cannot be *justified* by our *works*:" Then it proves excellently well against you, that we cannot be justified by faith as a work, according to your notion of justification.

I propose 3dly, to remark a little on those places where you have endeavoured to represent yourself very extensive, and *Aspasio* as very narrow in his notions of the grace of God; and see what appears in that regard in your favour.

You say, p. 213. "None have reason to complain, "if the second Adam died for all." Remember here, that you believe he died for all, only to obtain a conditional salvation for them. *Aspasio* says "to obtain a salvation complete in itself, and to be received by the perishing sinner, without any previous condition whatever."

Again, P. 217. "I believe he obtain'd for all a possibility of salvation." Remember again, your possibility is, *if they perform the conditions*. *Aspasio's* doctrine is not barely a possibility of salvation upon performance of condition, but a compleat salvation given, to be received; without any condition at all? You ask, "was it ever possible for them not to reject the atonement? if not, how is it just to cast them into a lake of fire." You may be asked, was it ever possible since the fall, for any man to be saved by his own righteousness? as he must, if he is saved at all, according to your possibility. The apostle is against you when he says, *Gal. iii. 21. If there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law.* You may be answered, it was just as possible for them not to reject the atonement, as it is possible for you not to be such an adversary to imputed Righteousness, and free salvation without conditions, as you are. You act freely,
you

you feel yourself under no necessity, but what originally arises from yourself: as your impotency is thus not of the natural kind, for want of the suitable faculties, but of the moral kind, from a contrary disposition of heart, it renders you not the less, but the more culpable.

P. 233. "For all his people," says *Aspasio*; you reply, "but what becomes of all other people? they must inevitably perish for ever." And do not you say so too, or do you hold universal salvation? Don't you allow that *his sheep hear his voice, and he that believeth not shall be damned*. If you mean by *inevitably* without their free choice of sin, or the way of destruction, without their free rejection of the remedy provided for them, or without such just cause of his proceedings herein, as shall vindicate his righteous judgments; there is not one single sentence in *Aspasio's* writings as I know of, to be the ground of such a charge.

Nor when *Aspasio* speaks of coming to Christ, to retort upon him for answer, "he himself has decreed not to give them that grace without which their coming is impossible." The difficulty most properly belongs to yourself, who make *coming* an entitling condition, at the same time you plead that it is the gift of God, that all men have it not, and perish because they have not this condition, or righteousness. *Aspasio's coming*, is a ceasing from our own works, from itself as a work, and betaking ourselves entirely to the righteousness of Jesus Christ.

When *Aspasio* says, "The grand end which God proposes, in all his favourable dispensations to fallen man, is to demonstrate the *sovereignty of his grace*." You reply, "not so, to impart happiness to his creatures is his grand end herein." Does *Aspasio* deny this? he only asserts, that God is a *sovereign* herein, in opposition to all claim upon him,

G

gounded

grounded upon our personal merit: and dare you deny this? Have you merited that share of earthly happiness, that has already been imparted to you? Have you merited your existence as a man, rather than to be a toad or a viper? Have you merited the opportunity that you at present have, of honouring or dishonouring God's truth before the people, and thereby leading, or misleading, thousands to eternal ruin? have you merited that, notwithstanding your abuse of this influence, notwithstanding all your opposition against our Lord and his truth; yet still there is a complete and finish'd salvation for you in *Jesus Christ*, for your immediate enjoyment by faith, when dropping all pretensions to merit or claim upon condition, you submit to receive it as a free gift! Have you merited any of these particulars, or has God acted herein like a sovereign? Can you prove that God's imparting happiness to his creatures is to be considered as an end, in opposition to his sovereignty? or, can you prove he is obliged to it?

But you say, "*Barely to demonstrate his sovereignty*," "is a principle of action fit for the great Turk, not the most high God." Who says this? does *Aspasio* say, "*barely to demonstrate his sovereignty*?" "Does he separate God's sovereignty from the happiness of his creatures? This is what you do and not him. His words are only "the sovereignty of his "grace;" and that as an argument to *Theron*, not to wait for righteousness in himself to ground a claim, but to come as a sinner to sovereign grace in Christ.

But what is the ground of your ill-will against this "sovereignty of grace?" You say, *you* would not deny what is necessary to the present comfort, and final acceptance of any, if it were in your power. And does God deny this to you? Is not all your letter to *Aspasio*, a demonstration that you will not *receive* it, tho' given you without any condition whatever?

And

And not only so, you will not let others receive it if you can by writing, preaching, or printing hinder them. If you mean, *you would not permit any one to reject it*, I suppose you would not have permitted the fall of Angels or men. If you were the almighty, we should all go to Heaven, and there would be no hell for men or devils; for you would not suffer any such thing as sin to be. Rare doings if JOHN WESLEY was but the Almighty! What a pity it is so benevolent a man should want power! When a man thus dares model heaven. Think not this irony too severe. For thus I conceive Lucifer himself reasoned, when *he abode not in the truth*.

Aspasio says, "He is a boundless ocean of good." You reply, "nay, that ocean is far from boundless, if it wholly passes by nine-tenths of mankind." According to *Aspasio*, salvation is granted to mankind without limitation, to be *received* without condition. It is you that limit the grace of God, and make it all depend upon conditions, so that no one soul can ever be saved that way, *viz.* By a new law, made with an insolvent creature, charging him under the name of faith and repentance, with the performance of all that obedience, which is required by the old law, and that as a condition of salvation. If you mean he is not a boundless ocean of good, if he *permits* any to reject this free salvation and perish in their pride, your assertion lies both against scripture and experience, and all I find you offer to support it is, "That you could sooner be a Turk, or Deist, or deny the being of a God." A very plain acknowledgment, what a slippery foundation your professed Christianity stands upon. Read *Ex. xxxiii. 19. Prov. 16. 4. IJa. xxix. 16, 17. Ch. xlv. 4—22, Rom. Ch. 9th, 10th, 11th*, and determine your choice as soon as you

see fit, for this "sovereignty of grace," is really the language and meaning of the Bible.

I proceed to consider the various turns you have given to the scriptures to support your conditional scheme; whereby if we will take your word as the sense of the writings of the Apostles and Prophets, we shall soon lose sight of Jesus Christ, as the chief corner stone, and see no necessity for God's being *just*, as well as the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus.

P. 214. *In the Lord, shall all the house of Israel be justified.* You say, "it ought unquestionably to be rendered, *by or thro' the Lord.*" We have only your bare word for that; * you know that the word is *in* Jehovah, therefore your assertion is a bold giving God himself the lie. But suppose it was so, are we to understand *by or thro' the Lord*, in opposition to *in the Lord*, as you do? Does the scripture know any thing of your new covenant of grace, that requires works as a condition. Besides, another Prophet says, his name shall be called the Lord our righteousness; you say, P. 216. "that is because we are both justified and sanctified thro' him." I answer, true we are so; but it is thro' him, as *Jehovah our righteousness*, not thro' him in your sense, as obtaining only a new bargain for us, wherein we are to be saved by our own righteousness.

P. 214. "*You are compleat in him.*" You say, the words literally rendered are, ye are filled with him; now this, Sir, you know to be literally untrue, *ἐν αὐτῷ* is literally *IN him*, and as it is quite agreeable to the whole context, and scope of the place, there is not the least shadow of a reason to depart from

* The words, *IN Jehovah*, are twice repeated, See Is. xlv. 24, 25. they are spoken of Christ, as will appear by comparing this place with Phil. ii. 10.

from it. But suppose your criticism was just, do you want the one rendering to contradict the other? Ye are filled with him, therefore ye are not compleat in him? No, you say, but “*the whole passage relates to sanctification not justification.*” You might as well say *the whole Bible*, now your hand is in; you have as much reason for one as the other. The whole passage relates to what it expresses plainly, that because Christ is our compleat sufficiency in himself, to answer all the purposes of wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption; that therefore we should keep on fully satisfied with him alone, in opposition to all the inventions of men, who want to introduce something else. This is evidently the purport, not only of that passage, but of the whole epistle. But you want us to understand, ye are filled with him, except in justification, and that must have the honour of our own righteousness.

St. James says of Abraham's offering up his promis'd seed, as a demonstration that he believed God's word, and depended upon that, and not upon the most probable appearances. *Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works his faith was made perfect.* That is, was made perfectly to appear, and the scripture was fulfilled, which said Abraham believed God, &c. James ii. 23.

You reply, p. 217, “The natural sense of the words is, *by the grace superadded, while he wrought those works, his faith was literally made perfect.*” You might with equal authority, property, and common sense, have told us, by the indulgence of the Pope, by the merits of saints, and by some works of supererogation, you, writing this letter to *Aspasio*, was *literally made perfect*. Your faith is what it is in it self, whether perfect or imperfect, and your works are what they are in themselves. Any

thing superadded to you, call it grace or what you will, tho' it might add to *your* intrinsic value and merit, yet that addition alters not the *nature* of the faith, or works of the man, to whom it is added. It is the *object* of faith, that is the proper perfection of the faith we treat of, and stands opposed to all works whatsoever. *To him that worketh not but believeth, &c.* And when *works* flowing from this faith, are of such a kind, as demonstrate that we thus trust in the Lord alone, then it may be said of us, as of *Abraham*, that our faith wrought with our works, and by such works is made perfect, that is, being put to the trial, is made perfectly to appear to be faith.

P. 217. "Certainly the *one thing* our Lord meant "was the love of God." And not Christ himself, with a righteousness that magnifies the Law and makes it honourable. This you boldly say, against plain evidence, and without a shadow of proof, but suppose it, what is the scriptural account of that love? *We love him, because he first loved us.* 1 John 4. 19. *Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life FOR US.* Ch. 3. 16. *That WE MIGHT LIVE THRO' HIM.* Ch. 4. 9. So that the imputed righteousness, you so little approve of, is quite essential to the true love of God. *

P. 229. "Was *David* a man after God's own heart all his life? So far from it, that we have "few more acceptable characters among all the men "of God recorded in scripture." The scripture expressly answers you, 1 Kings xv. 5. *David did that which was right in the eyes of the Lord, and turn'd not aside from any thing that he commanded him all the days of his life, save only in the matter of URIAH the Hittite.*

P. 219.

* See p. 54, 55.

P. 219. "The righteousness of God, means God's method of justifying sinners." Will it read so in those words. *He was made sin for us, that knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him?* 2 Cor. 5. 21. Besides, have you proved yet any other method whereby God has justified sinners but by the righteousness of Christ? Can any other method manifest justice as well as mercy herein? What a poor shift then is this; and how little does it enervate what *Aspasio* says, "that it means such a righteousness that it may justly challenge his acceptance." You answer, p. 220, "I cannot allow it at all." No, I suppose after all, *Jehovah* is to accept our imperfect righteousness, and count it a perfect one, which is a palpable absurdity.

P. 223, 226. "Grace reigns thro' righteousness by Jesus Christ our Lord." You say, "through justification and sanctification." I have more reason to reply, through justification and sanctification by *Christ the Lord our righteousness*, and not by your conditional scheme. Nothing is more apparent, than that the Apostle is here speaking of that righteousness which justifies by grace without works.

Says *Aspasio*, "Christ undertook to do every thing necessary for our redemption," namely in a covenant with the father. You reply, p. 221, "'Tis sure he did every thing necessary: " But how does it appear that "he undertook this?" *Ans.* Because he did it, unless he did it without undertaking to do it. But, "before the foundation of the world?" Yes, before the foundation of the world, unless he had no notion of undertaking such a matter 'till afterwards. But, "by a positive covenant between him and the father?" *Ans.* This is what is meant by the covenant, and you must disprove it to be a matter of design, before you can disprove this covenant, or the scriptures that
are

are so understood. If you want express words in this place, *Aspasio* has answered you ; " the very identical word, may not always occur, and yet the doctrine be abundantly taught." *Dial.* 5.

P. 222. " I would simply say, we are accepted " in the beloved." You only mean you have a new bargain, thro' the beloved, wherein the terms of acceptance is your own obedience. And therefore when *Aspasio*, says, " in order to intitle us to a reward, " there must be an imputation of righteousness," you reply, p. 220, " There must be an interest in Christ, " (meaning only an interest in this new bargain, supposed to be purchased by him) and then, (you say) " every man shall receive his own reward according to " his own labour." *Answ.* It is evident here, that the Apostle is speaking of the fruit of the ministry in labouring for souls, not at all of the conditions of salvation.

P. 222. " The seed of the Woman shall bruise " the head of the serpent." These words (you say) give not the least intimation of any such covenant as *Aspasio* speaks of. *Answ.* You cannot deny Christ to be the seed spoken of, and if so, why do not these words imply it was an agreed matter before this declaration was uttered ? You cannot suppose it was uttered before the thing was intended. If intended, by whom ? Undoubtedly by the same ELOHIM, as said, let us make man, and this includes in substance the whole that is pleaded for.

P. 226. " By him we have access to the father." True, and if *by him*, then not by the conditions of our own obedience, they cannot stand together, *Rom.* xi, 6. You really mean, not access it self ; but only your scheme of a new bargain, in which your obedience is the condition.

P. 227.

P. 227. *To shew unto man his uprightness.* You say, "convince him of God's justice in so punishing him," exclusive of any further discovery, for so you mean, if you mean any thing. There need not an *interpreter*, one among a thousand for this; nor will the next verse admit such an exclusive conviction. *Then he is gracious unto him, and saith, deliver him from going down into the pit, for I have found a ransom.*

Ibid. He shall receive a blessing from the Lord and righteousness. You say, "holiness," I answer by the authority of the text, *1Z₄D₁KE righteousness, Ps. xxiv, 5.* He has holiness in your sense of the word before. It is evidently something more than his personal holiness.

P. 228. *I will make mention of thy righteousness only.* You say, "of thy mercy," I answer with the text, *Ps. lxxi 16. "of thy righteousness.* So (you say again) it unquestionably means in that text, *in thy RIGHTEOUSNESS shall they be exalted, Ps. lxxxix. 16.* whereas it is the very same word again, and what you so confidently aver, is unquestionable false. Where the *Holy Ghost* says expressly *righteousness*, you will have it to be, *method of justifying,—mercy—holiness*, or any thing but what it really expresses, any thing but that *righteousness*, which declares God to be *just and the justifier of the sinner that believeth in Jesus*, Rom. iii. 26.

P. 228. *Zion shall be redeemed with judgment.* You say, "after severe punishment," why not according to *Isa. 53*? Why must Zion be her own redeemer? By suffering her own punishment? "*and her converts with righteousness*," you say, "with the tender mercy of God following that punishment." Why mercy, when the word is *righteousness*, and why not mercy, exhibited in Christ's name, as the redeemer by his sufferings and obedience? Indeed I cannot see but that
being

being an enemy to it in your heart, you would, right or wrong, exclude it from every text in the Bible. You expound these scriptures more like some inveterate Jew, than like one that professes the light of the New Testament.

Ibid. My **RIGHTEOUSNESS** ΤΖΕΔΕΚΕΤΙ, *shall not be abolished.* Is. xv. 6. You again contradict the express word, and say, *my mercy*; and mercy without righteousness, if you mean any thing by this opposition, which makes your perverse wickedness so much the greater.

Ibid. To bring in everlasting righteousness, or, the righteousness of ages, according to the text and septuagint, Dan. ix. 24. you contradict both, and say, "spotless holiness into our souls," of which there is not one syllable in the whole text, It is very evident by this, that your holiness is neither spotless, nor everlasting. The *everlasting righteousness*, or *righteousness of ages*, was the *righteousness* which Daniel says, the *Messiah* was to bring in, after such a time. You reply, p. 206, against this plain declaration of Heaven. "Then all who went out of the world before that hour were lost." A very trifling objection, and fully answered already p. 38. Christ's righteousness was certainly to be accomplish'd in its due time, and was as effectual for them who lived before his coming, as for us who are born since.

P. 228. That have obtained like precious faith, through the *righteousness* of God, and our saviour Jesus Christ. 2 Pet. i. 1. the words are literally, πίστις ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, *Faith in the RIGHTEOUSNESS of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ.* Not ἐλεος ὁμιλῶ *mercy*, but δικαιοσύνη *righteousness*, yet you most perversely contradict and say, "not *righteousness* but *Mercy*."

Ibid.

Ibid. Seek ye the kingdom of God and HIS RIGHTEOUSNESS, Mal. vi. 24. διακουvη αυτη, you say, "The holiness which springs from God reigning in you," of which again, there is not one syllable in this text: If you had said *his justification*, you had been much nigher the mind of the holy Ghost, and would have had the plain word to support you. As to God's reigning in us, the apostle says, that *grace reigns thro' righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord*, Rom. v. 21.

P. 229. By the obedience of one shall many be made righteous, Rom. v. 19. You say, "his dying for man." Here you allow his dying for us, is considered as obedience, and as the obedience of that one who makes many righteous. This is the righteousness of Christ imputed to us; and you have allowed, p. 214. "that we have no authority from scripture, for either thinking or speaking of his passive obedience separate from his active." This also overturns the gloss you put upon the *gift of righteousness* in the preceding verses, by calling it contrary to the express words, "the holiness which God works in them;" for it is evident that this (which you allow to be the obedience of Christ) is the righteousness spoken of in the preceding verses.

P. 230. For instruction in righteousness, you say, "in holiness," as excluding and setting aside the righteousness of Christ. There is no such holiness, it is an abomination.

Ibid. "God thro' Christ (you say) first accounts and then makes us righteous." The judgment of God is according to truth, he makes us righteous when he accounts us so: and when he accounts us righteous, it is upon account of the righteousness which makes us so, even the righteousness of Christ. Therefore the *righteousness which is of God by faith*, is not the condi-

conditional faith you treat of, nor does it know any thing of your scheme.

You give up all again by allowing, that, "faith" fixes on the meritorious *life*, and atoning death of "Christ;" for if *meritorious* for me, then in that sense *imputed* to me.

P. 231. *Our Saviour's obedience*—"O I say with the "good old Puritans our Saviour's *death* or *merits*." I don't wonder at your using the Puritans thus, after you have misused the scriptures as you have done. You well know that all the Puritans are against you to a man, as is also the articles and homilies of the church you profess. You yourself just now allow'd, that Christ's death was *his obedience* by which we are *made righteous*, and that it is not to be consider'd separate from his life; but however, you don't mind, you keep dreaming on.

Ibid. *My Mouth shall shew forth thy righteousness and thy salvation*, Ps. lxxi. 15. You again pervert these words and say, thy "mercy which brings my" salvation: not a syllable of this in the text, but every word your own invention, to impose upon your credulous reader, that entertains so good an opinion of you, as to imagine you are giving him the true sense of the original. The words literally are, *my mouth shall declare T Z, D, K, T, C H, T H Y R I G H T E O U S N E S S, a l l d a y t h y s a l v a t i o n.* Was you to deal thus with the current coin of the kingdom of *England*, you would be counted a traitor, and how dare thou thus traitorously abuse the word of God: and what an uncommon procedure to pretend to correct a man, who you know can discern your imposition in a moment; but it is plain what you aim at. If my societies read *Theron* and *Aspasia*, my scheme will fall to the ground: I will therefore pretend to correct him; my people will judge that I am an able critic; and have found fault where no fault was; by this means I shall wrest these

these scriptures out of the view in which that author has set them forth ; and if he discerns my fraud ever so, my interest is amongst my own people, who will take it all for granted, that my sense of the scripture is just, and a proper correction of Mr. *H* —, and this will sufficiently answer my purpose. You must excuse me here, your barefaced proceedings, and that with god's word, obliges me thus to think.

And after all, what advantage do you get by this pretended criticism ? would you insinuate, that the Psalmist, or any believer under the Old Testament, did not understand the mercy of God to be thro' the Messiah ? or that the mercy of God has no relation to imputed righteousness ? that they had no notion of sins being bore away by sacrifice ? or that their notion of mercy was according to your method of dealing with them, only according to their own righteousness as the condition of their acceptance with God ?

P. 231. " Not a word of his atoning blood." You are extremely concern'd about that, your works has made your faith (or rather your unbelief) very manifest in that particular. *Aspasio* you know includes *ALL Christ's righteousness*.

P. 232. " If we make shipwreck of the faith, how much soever is laid up in Christ, — we receive " nothing." Your very case, sir, you have not only been making shipwreck of *faith*, but of all those scriptures that set forth the *object* of faith, and in such a manner, as you have evidently made shipwreck of a *good conscience* in doing it. May the Lord have mercy on you, and convince you of your perverse wickedness and folly, before it be too late. If you were to serve the *Heathen poets*, as you have served the *scriptures*, I am persuaded your translation of them, would not be reckon'd worth two-pence.

Ibid. " What becomes of all those who think no-
" thing about *imputed righteousness* ?" *Ans.* If they
H think

think nothing about *the blessedness of the man to whom God IMPUTETH RIGHTEOUSNESS WITHOUT WORKS*, Rom. iv. 6. If they believe not on him that justifieth the ungodly, by IMPUTING RIGHTEOUSNESS UNTO THEM. ver. 5.—11.—4. they are evidently without the blessing of Abraham, Gal. iii. 14. They must stand or fall, according to their own righteousness. And let not such deceive themselves, the apostle informs us, that *as many as are of the works of the law, are under the curse*, Gal. iii. 10. *There is no name given under heaven amongst men whereby we must be saved but the name of Jesus*, Acts iv. 12.

Ibid. “How many that are full of faith and love, “if this be true, must perish everlastingly?” *Answer.* If they are full of faith and love, they shall do well; if their *doings* render them worthy of the divine regard, they shall be regarded on that account. The judge of all the earth will do right. These have no occasion for Jesus Christ: Christ is only a provision made for those who are guilty and condemn’d; a provision only for those WHOSE DAMNATION IS JUST. But let those who *think they are rich and increased with goods, and stand in need of nothing*, see to it that they are not at the same time *poor and miserable, and blind and naked*, Rev. iii. 17.

True Christian charity is form’d by the truth of the Gospel, and views the brightest character amongst men, under the just sentence of eternal wrath. It admits of no such notions of God’s mercy, as will dispense with this sentence, nor any sentiment of man’s righteousness as to plead a ballance in his favour. It sees no help for man but in what Christ has done and suffer’d; nor no claim unto it, but by the sovereign grant of heaven to the most guilty, thus levelling all mankind. Whatever contradicts this work of Christ, and this word of faith, as it is the device of Satan, and the destruction of souls, is an object of the just indignation

dignation of true Christian charity ; tho' it appears ever so delicately dress'd as did *Agag*. At the same time this true Charity is willing to endure all things and hope all things, for the truth's sake : In this charity could I lay down my life, that you might be a partaker of that *truth* and *grace* you so vehemently oppose ; more especially, as you are influential on so many, who are content to go on in the way that *seemeth right, tho' the end thereof is death*, Prov. xvi, 25. if you do but lead them. And, in this real Christian charity,

I am, SIR,

Unfeignedly Yours,

W. CUDWORTH.

H. POST.

P O S T S C R I P T.

IT is very remarkable, that in the case of god-fathers and god-mothers, p. 173. you have allow'd *substitution* and *imputation* in the strongest sense I ever read. You tell them "they promise nothing at all; "they engage for nothing, it is another person that "promises all this. Whatever is then promised or undertaken, it is not by them but by the child." Here God has no performance of the obedience promised, but both sides shuffle it off, the sureties being taught to say, "we did not promise, it was the Child;" and the child says, "I knew nothing of it:" In this case where God has no proper obedience rendered to him, you will allow of *substitution* and *imputation*, but in the case where our divine *εγγυ* or *surety*, has engaged and pay'd an obedience, which *magnifies the law and makes it honourable*; there it must be denied him. I mention this to give you a hint whose instrument you are in this affair, and what use the enemy of souls and of God's true glory, makes of you to oppose the truth and salvation of Jesus: verily in this *stand* we make for the truth of the gospel, *we are not wrestling against bare flesh and blood, but against principalities and powers, against the RULERS OF THE DARKNESS of this world, against SPIRITUAL WICKEDNESS IN HIGH PLACES, Eph. vi. 11.*

I have not undertaken this letter to you, as conceiving that any thing you have offer'd against Theron and Aspasio, is weaken'd by your arguments: So far from it, that I think a perusal of these volumes will afford a sufficient answer to every thing you have said. I have only entered the lists, as engaged in the common cause, therefore any weakness that may appear in what I have done, is no way chargeable on Aspasio, as he knows nothing of it, nor chargeable on the truth itself, which is ever the same, whether more weakly, or more ably defended.

What

What I have said in regard to the *sufficiency* of *The-ron* and *Aspasio*, against the objections that have been offer'd, will appear by the following extracts from Vol. II. Dial. X.

"*THERON*, (objecting says) After all, the imputation taught in scripture, is of our *own faith*."

"*ASPASIO*. This objection admits the thing in dispute, it admits the necessity of some active, positive righteousness, in order to our justification.—Why should we not suffer him (*Paul*) to be his own interpreter? He declares, that the cause of his own justification, was, not the *Grace of Faith*, but *the righteousness which is of God by faith*. Not the act of believing, but that grand and glorious object of a sinners belief, *the Lord our righteousness*."

"Besides, what was that faith of *Abraham*, to which the apostle refers? ——— It was faith in the promised seed, in *JESUS CHRIST* the righteous *."

—— Faith was counted to him for righteousness ——— as these windows are reckoned the lights of your house: why? Because they illuminate? no, but because they afford a passage to the illuminating rays. So we are saved by Grace thro' faith; by grace imputing, thro' faith accepting the righteousness of *JESUS CHRIST*. When our Lord declares to the diseased woman, *thy faith hath made thee whole*: how are we to understand his words? That the patient's belief, and not the agency of Christ, wrought the cure? To suppose this, would be extremely derogatory to the power of our great physician. And if we ascribe justification to the act of believing, this will be equally derogatory to the obedience of our great Mediator. In the former case, Christ and his omnipotent operation, were all in all. In the latter case, Christ and his infinite merit, are all in all."

* Compare Gen. xv. 5, 6. with Gal. iii. 16.

"Faith is very particularly distinguished from the righteousness which justifies. We read of the righteousness which is *by* faith, which is *of* faith. A method of speaking which plainly denotes, that faith itself is not our justifying righteousness.—If faith itself was the matter of our justification, I see not how boasting could be excluded; how the law could be magnified; or what reason the apostle could have, to account all things, but the righteousness of Christ, meaner than dross."

"Say not, that we presume to correct inspiration. We only interpret the inspired word in an *harmonious consistency* with itself. This sense is agreeable to the prevailing doctrine, and to the current language of scripture.—To the prevailing doctrine; which is *a believing in him, who justifieth the ungodly*—To the current language; as when God is call'd our *fear*, our *hope*, our *joy*. In these places, the act is undoubtedly put for the object. So, in the passage before us, the act of faith seems to denote the *object* of faith."

"To be plainer still—we are justified by faith, in the same manner, as we are fed by the hand; or as we are said, to drink of a cup. Neither the hand nor the cup are the *cause* of our sustenance, but the *instruments*, one of conveying it, the other of receiving it.—If an apostle affirms, *we are justified by faith*: faith itself declares, *In the Lord I have righteousness*. Put these passages together, and you will have the true sense of our doctrine, and the true doctrine of the gospel."

"Christ is likened to *cloathing*; and believers are said to *have put on Christ*. Now, it cannot be the act of putting on, that covers our bodies, or keeps them warm; but the commodious garment, which is wore.—He is compared to *bread*: *I am the bread of life*. Is it the act of eating, that strengthens the constitution,

tion, and recruits our spirits? No surely; but the food eaten and digested. --Christ was typified by the *City of refuge*; and sinners, by the obnoxious manslayer. Who, if he fled to one of those privileged abodes; and there remained, was safe. No prosecution against him could be valid; He had nothing to fear from the avenger of blood. In this case, was it the bare act of flying, that screened the criminal? By no means: this *conveyed* him to a place of security. But the *place itself* was his sanctuary, his asylum, his safeguard."

"Faith is stiled, *a receiving of Christ*: As many as received him, to them gave he power, or granted the privilege, to become the sons of God. The office of faith is, according to this definition, not to contribute its quota, much less to deposit the whole sum, but to take and use the inestimable gift. — Faith is called, *a looking unto Jesus*; in allusion, I suppose, to the famous expedient, provided for the wounded Israelites. Our crucified Lord was prefigured by the brazen serpent; our guilt, by the stings of the fiery serpents; and our faith, by looking to the miraculous remedy. Did the healing power, I would ask, reside in the mere act of viewing? No: but in the emblem of a dying Saviour, elevated on the pole, and ordained for the recovery of the people. Here all the efficacy was lodged. From hence it was all derived. The action of the eye, like the office of faith, was only to fetch home, and apply the sanative virtue."

"Once more; faith is represented, as *laying hold on* God our Saviour; *cleaving* to the Lord---Please to take notice of yonder vine. Its shoots are weak, and its branches flimsy. Being absolutely unable to support themselves; they are furnished with a very remarkable set of *claspers*. Which like so many fingers, lay hold on the pegs of the wall, or fasten themselves to the poles within their reach. Without such

a provision, the boughs must lie prostrate on the ground, and be exposed to the insults of every foot. Whereas by this kind contrivance of nature, *so creeping* a plant, will climb into the air, and enjoy the breeze; *so stable* a plant, will stand out the winter, and defy the storms. — An instructive admonition to sinners! And no contemptible illustration of faith, especially in its principal and most distinguishing employ! Thus let us apprehend the blessed Jesus; hold us fast by our adored Redeemer; cleave to his ineffable worthiness, as those twining tendrils, by repeated circumvolutions, adhere to their substantial supporters; then shall we rise, by merits *not our own*, from the most abject and miserable condition, to a state of everlasting honour and joy.

ADVERTISEMENT

FOR the further confirmation of the truth contained in p. 46, 47, 48. see the two following spots:

- I. Imputation of the sins of the Church to Christ
grounded upon her mystical union with him.
- II. A conference between a sick man and a minister...
To be told with this.

6
on the
y foot.
creep-
by the
winter,
tion to
th, ef-
ng em-
hold
ineffa-
peated
porters;
om the
state of
truth con-
following
to Christ,
minister.